

Vol. XXVIII
No. 3

July, 1929

THE
SOUTH ATLANTIC
QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-----|
| THE FUTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY | <i>Robert Stanley Rankin</i> | 225 |
| LINCOLN IN THE RÔLE OF DICTATOR | <i>James G. Randall</i> | 236 |
| THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE SAAR | <i>Harold V. Villard</i> | 253 |
| BARRIE'S DUAL PERSONALITY | <i>Homer E. Woodbridge</i> | 269 |
| SIR JOHN RANDOLPH—ILLUSTRIOS UNCLE | <i>Eudora Ramsey Richardson</i> | 281 |
| DANTE FOR TODAY | <i>Henry Bellamann</i> | 293 |
| THE DAILY AND WEEKLY PRESS OF ENGLAND IN 1861 | <i>Henry D. Jordan</i> | 302 |
| BOOK REVIEWS | | 318 |

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY FOR
THE SOUTH ATLANTIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
BY THE DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DURHAM, N. C., U. S. A.

Issued in the months of January, April, July, and October
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER AT THE POSTOFFICE AT DURHAM

75 cents a Copy

\$3.00 a Year

The South Atlantic Quarterly

Edited by William K. Boyd and William H. Wannamaker

OFFICERS: ROBERT L. FLOWERS, PRES., ALBERT M. WEBB, VICE-PRES., D. W. NEWSOM, SEC.-TREAS
DIRECTORS: W. P. FEW, WM. H. GLASSON, R. L. FLOWERS, WM. H. WANNAMAKER, D. W. NEWSOM, W. K. BOYD

FOUNDED IN 1902 BY THE 9019 SCHOLARSHIP SOCIETY OF TRINITY COLLEGE

This journal was founded in January, 1902, in order to afford better opportunity in the South for discussion of literary, historical, economic, and social questions. It knows no sectional jealousy and aims to offer a publishing medium in which respectful consideration will be accorded to all who have some worthy contribution to make in its chosen field.

For their journal the editors and publishers solicit the support of thinking people in all sections of the country and especially in the South. Communications in regard to articles, book reviews, and editorial matters should be addressed to the Editors, SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY, Duke University, Durham, N. C. Subscriptions and all communications relating to advertisements and business matters should be addressed to the Duke University Press, Durham, N. C.

Subscriptions payable in advance. Advertising accounts payable after first insertion of copy.

Contents of Last Two Numbers

Number 1, January, 1929

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Can the South Attain to National Standards in Education?..... | Edgar W. Knight |
| Cornelie's Dilemma..... | Francis A. Waterhouse |
| "The Unholy Alliance of Pisa—" A Literary Episode..... | Nettie S. Tillet |
| Jefferson Davis and the Confederate Patronage..... | Harrison A. Tresler |
| Count Aleksyey Konstantinovich Tolstoy..... | Clarence A. Manning |
| Jamie Boswell's Thorn in the Flesh..... | Waldo H. Dunn |
| Precursors of Turner in the Interpretation of the American Frontier...Book Reviews..... | Herman Clarence Nixon |

Number 2, April, 1929

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Cycles of Cotton Mill Criticism..... | Harriet L. Herring |
| Industry and the Imagination..... | Granville Hicks |
| The British in the East..... | William McDougall |
| Pursuing Fugitive Slaves..... | Charles S. Sydnor |
| Times May Change But Does <i>The New York Times</i> ?..... | Marguerite Hall Albjerg |
| Horace Walpole as Dramatist..... | Karl L. Holznecht |
| Who Reads Carl Sandburg?..... | Clark H. Compton |
| Mr. Richard Aldington..... | Paul F. Baum |
| Book Reviews | |

Copyright, 1929, by Duke University Press

Duke University

ARTS AND SCIENCE - LAW - EDUCATION

RELIGION - ENGINEERING

Full Opportunity for Graduate Study
and Research

Summer Sessions

For Information Address

R. L. FLOWERS, Secretary

DUKE UNIVERSITY

DURHAM, N. C.

THE OLDEST BANK IN DURHAM



THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF DURHAM

Privileged to be of statewide service in commercial banking, in the execution of wills and trusts, and in the transaction of all phases of modern banking matters, will welcome the addition of new friends to its thousands of patrons.

Capital \$600,000.
Surplus, Reserves and Profits \$550,000

Durham Loan & Trust Co.

*One of the strong, progressive banks of
Greater Durham.*

JOHN SPRUNT HILL, President
H. W. BORING, Sec. & Treas.
B. W. ROGERS, Asst. Sec. & Treas.

WANTED: Following back numbers of the *Trinity College Historical Papers*: Series 1 and 8 (we will pay \$1.00 per copy). Series 5 (we will pay 75c per copy). Will also purchase any issues of *South Atlantic Quarterly* previous to January, 1911.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS,

Durham, N. C.

W. L. ELKINS, C. P. A.

GEORGE T. DURHAM, C. P. A.

ELKINS & DURHAM
Certified Public Accountants
Richmond, Virginia

Members of

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ACCOUNTANTS
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
VIRGINIA SOCIETY OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

We make a specialty of College and University accounting
and invite inquiries regarding accounting problems from
officials of such institutions.

Insurance of All Kinds—

We represent the best com-
panies in the world and
wish to extend our services
to you.

HOME INSURANCE AGENCY CO.

"Dollars for your Ashes"

Corcoran Street

Phone F-146

DURHAM, N. C.

JOHN A. BUCHANAN President

CHAS. T. ZUCKERMAN, Secretary



Thirty-Five Years of Experience

In manufacturing made-to-order Fly Screens has been had by this Company and our effort has always been to meet the insistent demand for something better in Insect Screens for better houses. A catalog has been prepared for your use which can be had for the asking.

Estimates made without obligation.

**THE CINCINNATI FLY SCREEN CO., CINCINNATI,
OHIO**

Although no complete back files of the *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY* are available, we have full sets from January, 1911, to date. Also a few miscellaneous issues previous to that date.

We offer complete back files of the *Hispanic American Historical Review*.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DURHAM, N. C.

Cultivated People

read

The *Sewanee Review*

A QUARTERLY OF LIFE AND LETTERS

EDITED BY

WILLIAM S. KNICKERBOCKER



THE SEWANEE REVIEW is widely recognized as a literary review of unusual distinction. It is the oldest quarterly of its kind in the United States. Preserving the fine temper of Southern culture and refinement, it is concerned with the best that has been and is being written in Europe and America.

It is never *merely clever*,
or *controversial*,
or *prejudiced*.

It appeals to people
of *discernment*,
of *intelligence*,
of *culture*.

Its essays by distinguished writers are marked by a tone of quality.

Its reviews are thoughtful and balanced.

¶ The subscription price for one year is \$3.00; the single copy sells for 75c.

¶ Subscribe to-day for yourself or for a friend.

ADDRESS:

The *Sewanee Review*

Sewanee, Tennessee

High Grade Combed Peeler and Fully Double
Carded Peeler Cotton Yarns, for the Weaving,
Knitting, and Converting Trade

GRAY MANUFACTURING CO.
FLINT MANUFACTURING CO.
ARLINGTON COTTON MILLS
PARKDALE MILLS, INC.
ARROW MILLS, INC.
MYRTLE MILLS, INC.
ARKRAY MILLS, INC.

GENERAL OFFICES: GASTONIA, N. C.
J. H. Separk, Sec. & Treas. J. L. Gray, Gen. Mgr., Manufacturing

GENERAL SALES OFFICE: 131 East 23rd St., NEW YORK CITY
H. A. Florsheim, General Sales Manager



Thousands of improvements in central office equipment in 5 years

*An Advertisement of the
American Telephone and Telegraph Company*

IN THE last five years there have been hundreds of improvements of major importance in telephone central office equipment in the Bell System, and lesser improvements by the thousands. Improvements have been made in switchboard cable, in relays, in cords, in condensers, in selectors, and in the development of new and better materials for all kinds of equipment used in the central offices.

These improvements have not only helped to meet the steadily increasing complexity



of telephone requirements. They also make possible the high-speed service which is eliminating delay from the personal contacts of people anywhere in the United States, whether they be separated by three floors of a building or three thousand miles of country.

There is no standing still in the Bell System. Better and better telephone service at the lowest cost is the goal. Present improvements constantly going into effect are but the foundation for the greater service of the future.

The South Atlantic Quarterly

Vol. XXVIII

JULY, 1929

Number 3

THE FUTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

ROBERT STANLEY RANKIN

Duke University

THE ROAD which the Democratic Party has travelled down through the history of the United States has been long and varied. The luck of the road during the party's early history was truly astounding, and it was able to stay in power for many years. Since 1860, however, the road has been rough and rocky, until today the party has become, to many, just "the opposition party" or "the minority party," over which the Republicans step to political triumphs. Has the Democratic Party passed through the two stages mentioned by Chateaubriand, the age of force and the age of privilege, and is it now about to be extinguished in the age of vanity? Or is it possible for the party to rise from the ashes of defeat and again take its proper rôle in the political life of the United States?

Never was the above question more pertinent than at present. The dust of the 1928 election has cleared away and it shows another national election lost by the Democrats, both houses of Congress safely Republican, and the solid South broken—something that the most ardent Texan or Virginian Republican hardly dared to hope for. What then, does, the future hold in store for the Democrats? Norman Thomas maintains that the Democratic Party is dead, and has ceased to be a real factor in American politics. He maintains that the only road left open to the party is to join with the Liberals and form a new political group that will have strength and vigor. On the other hand the *Manchester Guardian* says that it is too early to announce the demise of the Democratic Party.¹

¹ *Manchester Guardian*, Nov. 30, 1928.

Governor Roosevelt, after receiving information from Democrats all over the country, issues the following optimistic statement:

It can be stated as a fact, that never before in the history of the Democratic Party, at least during the last twenty-five years, has there been so clearly a militant, aroused and aggressive determination to continue actively to fight, not only with a view to the national election, four years from now, but for the coming Congressional elections in 1930 as well, and to begin now unceasing and constant effort to place the Democratic Party in control of all branches of the government at Washington. . . . I think that it is a safe statement to make that the effect of our failure at the polls last year instead of discouraging the members of the Democratic party has been to arouse in them the will to win.²

The question before us, then, of "The Future of the Democratic Party" is not only a question of interest to Democrats but, as our government is based on the two-party system, it is worthy of the interest of every good American citizen.

In each of the last three national elections, the Democratic Party has been badly defeated. It is impossible for the organization to continue as a losing party and all Democrats agreed with Mr. Smith when he said that he was "entirely dissatisfied to have the Democratic Party be simply a party of opposition."³ Then, granting that we cannot continue as we are today, there are just two roads open to the party—disintegration or rehabilitation. Of these two alternatives rehabilitation is the more desirable. Yet certain changes must be made in the party organization, certain principles must be incorporated in the party program, or otherwise the Democratic Party—already described as nobody's party—will become a nonentity. It is the purpose of this paper to inquire into the changes that would seem advisable and to ascertain, if possible, the principles upon which the future of the Democratic Party depends.

I

THE NEED FOR HARMONY WITHIN THE PARTY

In the last election many of the shortcomings of the Democracy were made clear and never before was the lack of

² *New York Times*, Jan. 14, 1929.

³ *The Literary Digest*, Feb. 2, 1929.

harmony within its ranks more evident. In the national convention of 1896 two wings of the party were evident and clearly defined, and these wings maintained their identity all during the period of Mr. Bryan's leadership. United for a time under Woodrow Wilson, a great leader, favored by a break in the Republican ranks, and drawn together by the heavy demands made by the War, the party remained in power for eight years—the longest continued period of control that it has enjoyed since the days of Franklin Pierce and James Buchanan. Even the genius of Woodrow Wilson was unable to hold its leaders together and the party was badly defeated in the election of 1920. In 1924 the party passed through one of the most violent convention struggles in its history, to be again annihilated at the polls. In 1928 the shoals of the convention being safely passed, the party hoped successfully to make port but was wrecked by the election itself—a condition that was due, to a great extent, to the lack of harmony within the organization. When a great number of Democrats would rather see a Republican in power than another Democrat, party conditions have reached a startling and certainly a perilous condition—yet such was the condition of the Democratic Party in the last election. Factions were so strong within the organization that a Republican leader in one of the states of the so-called Solid South related to me how his party, in the last election, did not have a state organization but let the opposition to the Democratic nominee be carried on by a faction of the Democratic Party, the result being that that state's electoral vote was cast for Mr. Hoover. It is not the purpose of this paper to justify or defend any branch of the Democratic Party, but to show the lack of harmony that at present exists within the organization.

Arthur Krock, after the election of 1924, characterized the people who worked for and voted the Democratic ticket as "Damn Fool Democrats". In that year men went to a convention and labored for days, fought each other in the convention till both sides were exhausted and finally, after destroying, by this internecine struggle, all chances of winning the election in November, then returned home and live quietly under

a Republican administration for the next four years. Mr. Krock believes that

While a fight with the Republicans has a certain element of appeal, it involves the adoption of a definite punctilio and that spoils the fun for a true Democrat. To be required to temper his speech, to convey the manifestly impossible admission that a Republican may have blood, brains, piety and worth in the same ratio as a Democrat—these are the responsibilities of an open fight before the electorate which bore with inexpressible ennui the true disciple of Jefferson and Jackson. It is only a combat with other Democrats that a thorough Jacksonian really enjoys. To that he advances at the double, carrying every lethal weapon in his arsenal. Parents, brothers, cousins; let any of these bar his path as, with nervous fingers, he rushes toward the jugular of another Democrat, and patricide and fratricide become misdemeanors.⁴

In 1928 all chances of winning the election vanished in the smoke of party strife and, unfortunately, the lack of harmony lingers on. While we have some indications of party harmony, yet the greater amount of evidence is to the contrary. A Chicago Democrat in reply to Governor Smith's demand for party funds, sent a check accompanied by a statement that he would not do it under any circumstances if he thought the southern bigots would ever get control of the Democratic National Committee. On the other hand, Representative Box, of Texas, the Democratic party whip, maintains, "If the situation and forces which nominated Governor Smith and controlled the campaign continue to dominate the party, Texas and the entire south will cease to be Democratic, the east will not be controlled, the west will be permanently estranged, and the party will break up, some of its voters going to the Republican Party, others remaining with the organization, and others becoming independents."⁵ There is no need of further evidence of the lack of harmony in the party, yet the following quotation from a statement made by a professor in a New England university, is very enlightening. He says that he gathers

from the newspaper reports that the Southern Senators and Congressmen are making an effort to patch up the differences resulting from the last campaign, with the Northern Democrats. They might as well save their breath. Scores of former Democrats in the North who voted

⁴ *The American Mercury*, March, 1925, p. 257.

⁵ *Durham (N. C.) Morning Herald*, Jan. 6, 1929.

for Smith in the past campaign are, like myself, through with the Democratic party. We feel that the party has been wrecked on the rocks of bigotry and so we step aside. We nominated a great man, a second Andrew Jackson, for the Presidency and the South turned against him. That was the privilege of the South. It is now our privilege to leave the field to you people and in 1932 you can nominate whom you please. It does not matter whom you choose. The Democratic party as a national factor in our body politic is dead.

Other Democrats who have carefully analyzed the returns in the last election and who are willing to work for the success of the party are willing to sacrifice some of their private beliefs for the welfare of the group. The Democratic Party must have more voters, and these cannot be won by party strife. Josephus Daniels sees this need for harmony and Governor Roosevelt is sponsoring the organization of Democratic clubs to promote good feeling and to aid the reorganization of the party. It will take some time for the Democrats to overcome the strife of the election but, if ex-Governor Smith uses some of his usual good sense, if the rank and file of the party desires strongly to win, and if a strong aggressive leader can be found who is acceptable to the different geographical divisions of the party, there is, as Will Rogers said, "plenty of life in the old girl yet."⁶

II

THE GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISIONS WITHIN THE PARTY

At present the Democratic Party is not only divided into Smith and Anti-Smith factions, but there is a more fundamental division; it is divided geographically into a group of the East, one of the South, and one of the West. This is the real tragedy of the situation. The party in the East is dominated by Tammany, and is the party of the immigrant and of the people whom the Republicans have antagonized during their control of national politics. It is wet and, to a great extent, Catholic. The party in the South is dry, predominantly Protestant, and is a group of well organized state machines. Unfortunately the group in the South and the group in the East have very little in common. The Democrats of the West, if

⁶ *Saturday Evening Post*, Jan. 19, 1929.

we may use this term, are predominately liberal, using the name "Democrats" only to distinguish them from the old-line Republicans. These "Democrats" have little hesitancy in scratching tickets and to a great extent they are independent in politics. At the conclusion of the 1924 election this group might have been more closely united with the party but, unfortunately, in 1928 they were voting the Republican ticket not because they loved Herbert Hoover more, but because they considered him the lesser of two evils. It will take nothing short of a miracle to weld these three groups together, yet miracles have been performed. These three groups all voted for Woodrow Wilson, and, if a man could be nominated, say from the East, who understood and worked with the South and West, who knows what would happen in the next few years? The union will be a difficult undertaking, but not an impossible one.

III

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY MUST BE A LIBERAL PARTY

When we consider the principles that are behind the Democratic Party, it appears that there is very little hope for the party unless it becomes the liberal party of America. At present, in the United States, there is but little doubt that Liberalism is out of favor with the American people. Conservatism is in the saddle and, while the stock market soars, everybody is happy and prosperous. Yet who can say when the tide will turn? Fumbles are made in politics as well as in football; costly errors always result in favor of the opponents and often change the whole tide of the game. It is about time for a change to take place in American politics and the Democrats will benefit by the change if they adopt a liberal policy. In doing this the desires of the majority of the Democrats will also more nearly be satisfied. Not only would such a policy hold the Democrats, but it would also attract many liberal Republicans. Although the West went for Hoover in the last election, there are many signs that liberalism is not dead. While Mr. Hoover was winning Wisconsin by 100,000 votes, Mr. LaFollette carried the state by 400,000. Montana went Republican, yet Senator Wheeler was elected. Washington also

went Republican, yet Senator Dill was able to carry the state. Minnesota gave its electoral vote for Mr. Hoover and at the same time Mr. Shipstead, running as an Independent, carried the state by 300,000 votes. Although Arizona went for Hoover, Senator Ashurst was re-elected, and he was a Catholic. If we could attract the Liberals of the country to the Democratic standard, it would add much to the strength of the party and at the same time would be a serious blow to the Republicans.

The future success of the Democratic Party depends, to a great extent, also, on its ability to secure the women's vote. Unfortunately Mr. Smith did not appeal to the women of the South and West. His general make up—his accent—all were against him. It was clearly evident, even last summer, that the women were dissatisfied with the Democratic nominee, and the lack of sympathy became more pronounced as the election approached. So, as far as the future is concerned, it will be necessary for the leaders to take into consideration the women and the candidate must be one who will appeal to both sexes. Certainly the vote of the women proved of enormous benefit to Mr. Hoover. The women therefore must be courted by the Democratic Party, overtures must be made to them, and their wishes must be anticipated.

IV

REFORM IN THE PARTY ORGANIZATION

It is evident today that the party is in need of a permanent organization. This point has been emphasized by both Governor Roosevelt and Mr. Smith. It is the belief of leading Democrats all over the United States that the party must be reorganized and a permanent organization established. Mr. Raskob as a national chairman, because of his previous connections and not because of his ability, is probably not the best man to build the new organization. However, all that the party consists of today is state machines and these state machines, particularly those in the South, are torn with dissension. The task is to weld together these state organizations into one real party, and it is a man's task. According

to the *Baltimore Sun*, "The Democratic Party does not exist between elections. At present we defy anyone to identify it. The jackass's personality is split; he is in a fit of maniac depressive insanity; he is suffering from amnesia, and the chances are that it will require three and a half years to pull him together again."⁷ However, the job is not an impossible one and it stands today as a challenge to the leaders of the party. Permanent machinery must be established and plans must be laid for years ahead. A careful study of the recent election should be made and the greatest work should be done in the states, which, while Republican, yet contain a great Democratic minority. As Mr. Smith said, in his recent speech over the radio, "a change of only 420,000 votes out of the total of 36,500,000 votes cast, properly scattered throughout the states, would have altered the whole complexion of the electoral college and would have given the Democratic party 269 electoral votes, which would have meant victory instead of defeat."⁸ Certainly a party that can poll over fifteen million votes has boundless possibilities.

However, it must not be a party that exists four months in four years, but a political body that is well organized and has a definite purpose. The Atlanta *Constitution* maintains that the trouble with the Democratic party leaders of today is that

they have accepted the theory that, being the party of the minority and the opposition, it must be distinctly an opportunist party. That means that it must pursue a policy of watchful waiting to catch up the errors and derelictions of the dominant Republican party, and make of them the issues of a future campaign to unhorse the party. There must be a comprehensive organization and an intelligent, militant leadership, if that result is to be won.⁹

With a permanent organization and with a definite liberal policy the Democrats would offer a challenge to the progressive citizen that could not be denied.

⁷ Quoted in the *Literary Digest*, Feb. 2, 1929.

⁸ *New York Times*, Jan. 17, 1929.

⁹ *Atlanta Constitution*, Feb. 2, 1929.

V

CHANGES IN THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

This permanent organization being secured, there are certain rules of procedure, particularly in the National Convention, the abolition of which would add much to the life of the party and would do much to eradicate the convention friction and thus restore harmony. These changes, if made, would include the abolition of the two-thirds rule, the unit rule, and a change in the manner of representation, so that the number of delegates would be in proportion to the voting strength of that party in the state, rather than its Congressional representation. The two-thirds rule was adopted originally because it was thought that the nomination thus made would have more weight. Only twice has a majority candidate been kept from obtaining the presidency by this rule, Martin Van Buren in 1844 and Champ Clark in 1912. Still the rule has caused much trouble and dissatisfaction in the convention. As the severity of the unit rule has been relaxed, the bad effects of the two-thirds rule have become more evident, and today even such men as John W. Davis, George F. Milton, and Josephus Daniels are in favor of the abolition of both the two-thirds rule and the unit rule.

It is indeed true that the system of choosing delegates to the national convention is far from democratic. Representation should be based upon the voting strength of the party and some alterations should be made immediately in order to accomplish this purpose. Certainly such a change would add much to the character of the national convention.

A further alteration in the proceedings of the convention, so that the platform may be adopted after the nomination of the President, would prove advantageous. For, as Sait says, "The electorate has come to regard the candidate rather than the convention as the responsible exponent of party policies and to attach more importance to his personal declarations than to the pronouncements of the platform."¹⁰ It would also unite the platform and the candidate and there would be

¹⁰ New York *Herald Tribune*, Nov. 11, 1928.

less likelihood of differences existing between the two, as proved so fatal in the recent contests.

VI

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN THE SOUTH

The future of the Democratic Party in the South excites much speculation from the average southerner, but there are certain definite conclusions that we may reach. At present the South is busy trying to forget the recent election and is attempting to heal many old wounds. Yet the future must be faced. It appears that the Republican Party is going to spend much time and money in perfecting the Party's organization in the southern states and newspaper headlines already have appeared stating that Hoover is to rebuild the Republican Party in the South. The hardest fact that the Democrats must face is that once a state goes Republican it will be much easier for that state to go likewise in the future. Independent voting has been encouraged, which will result in the rank and file of the voters getting what they want. Southerners will vote the Democratic ticket not because they are Southerners, but because they are Democrats. However, the Democratic Party is still in the saddle in the Southern States and its strength will be evident in 1930 and even more pronounced in 1932. Harmony in the South will depend to a great extent upon the position that ex-Governor Smith takes in the party organization. If he runs in 1932, as some of the New York papers are already advocating, the Solid South will again be demolished. On the other hand, if a candidate is nominated in 1932 who understands the South, even though he may live in New York or Idaho, the South will again go solidly Democratic. It is the belief of one prominent Southerner that "the South has not turned Republican. It revolted against the man rather than against the party, though the platform was disappointing to Southern Democrats. Hoover Democrats may be largely counted on to support the Democratic party, provided it gets a Democratic platform and a candidate not antagonistic to Southern views."¹¹ The Democrats, while they

¹¹ *New York Herald-Tribune*, Nov. 11, 1928.

remain in the majority in the South, have an opportunity to increase the party vote if sound progressive principles are adopted.

VII

In conclusion, therefore, while "of no American institution has prediction been so sterile, and the application of remorseless logic so bewilderingly unsatisfactory as of the Democratic Party,"¹² yet it is evident that that party must have a thorough reorganization if it desires to amount to anything in the future and therefore it appears that the following measures will be necessary:

First: A program calling for harmony between the different factions of the party.

Second: The adoption of a liberal progressive policy.

Third: A direct appeal must be made to the woman voter.

Fourth: Some alterations must be made in the rules of the Democratic Party.

Fifth: A permanent party organization must be established.

Sixth: The rank and file of the Democratic Party must have the will to win, and this requires real constructive leadership.

¹² G. F. Milton: "Can We Save the Democratic Party?" *Century Magazine*, Vol. CX, p. 94.

LINCOLN IN THE RÔLE OF DICTATOR

JAMES G. RANDALL

University of Illinois

HOW MANY more thousand books must be written before we learn what sort of man he really was?"¹ This remark was made in a recent brochure by a Lincolnian scholar who was aiming his pointed criticisms at a startling hoax in the form of forged Lincoln documents which had been prominently published in one of the finest and most honorable of the nation's magazines. That such a hoax was possible offers food for reflection both to the historian and to the general public. The forgery, be it noted, was clumsy, not clever. Letters more unlike Lincoln's, in form and substance, could hardly have been fabricated; yet they were for a time accepted as genuine. Though no character in American history is more admired nor more written about than Lincoln, the historian's responsibility of rescuing his personality from the myth and sentimental fiction with which it has become encrusted has not yet been fully met. The burden of the present article is to exhibit a side of Lincoln's presidency which is not fully understood and to show how, as wartime chief in a democracy, the liberal statesman became, by the pressure of events, the wielder of a greatly expanded executive authority—how the advocate of government of, by and for the people exercised more independent power and approached a dictatorship more closely than has any other president. Presidential authority was enormously increased during the World War; but Wilson's power to deal with disloyal practices and his authority over material factors—over railroads, food, fuel, trade and shipping—were in the main conferred by Congress; while Lincoln's most striking powers, as in his Emancipation Proclamation and the arbitrary arrests, were independently assumed. As a constitutional question the subject is of great interest, and in the light of present-day dictatorships it has renewed significance; but to many its chief meaning will

¹ Paul M. Angle, in *Bulletin of the Lincoln Centennial Association* (Springfield, Ill.), Dec. 1, 1928, p. 8. See also "The Minor Collection: a Criticism," by the same writer, *Atlantic Monthly* (April, 1929), vol. 143, pp. 516-525.

appear in its commentary on Lincoln himself. It is the reaction of Lincoln's mind to his difficult position, and the manner in which he fitted his personality into an uncongenial rôle, that especially challenge attention.

Lincoln, the man of peace, author of the Gettysburg Address, wielding a dictator's sceptre, seems a paradox. Yet it was the custom of Lincoln's opponents to denounce him as a despot. Opposition orators spoke of "Dictator Lincoln" and compared the President to Nero or Caligula, while such newspapers as the New York *World* and the Chicago *Times* lashed the administration with severe editorials. Even Lincoln's friends showed distress at his unusual measures. Such a mildly disposed conservative as Senator Browning of Illinois, though a close friend, wrote despondently in his diary of the President's giving himself over to "the radicals"; and Senator Fessenden remarked that the suspension of the *habeas corpus* privilege in the loyal States was "an exercise of despotic power." That the present popular notion should conflict with this contemporary opinion is due in part to the fact that the full story of Lincoln's problems as President is still to be told; for his presidency is that part of his life which is most imperfectly understood and on which the biographers have shed the least light. Yet when all is said one must recognize here a real meeting of opposites—a real uncongeniality between the hard circumstances of Lincoln's day of power and the type of man he was.

I

At the very outset of the Civil War, Lincoln gave the policy of the government a dictatorial turn by assuming far-reaching powers independently of Congress. Every other war president has submitted to Congress the question of war or peace; but President Lincoln, taking upon his own shoulders the decision as to how the situation should be met, launched a whole series of war measures and irrevocably committed the country to a definite war policy months before Congress was even called into session. He treated the conflict not as war, but as something like a magnified Whiskey Insurrection, call-

ing forth the militia to suppress "combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings," and protesting through his Secretary of State when the Queen of England quite reasonably recognized Southern belligerency by proclaiming neutrality as between the United States and the Confederate States.

This interpretation of the conflict as insurrection, not war, added to the President's importance. Congress declares war, or the existence of a state of war; but it is the President who determines the existence of insurrection or rebellion. Suppression of rebellion is an executive function for which special weapons, particularly the summoning of the militia, have been placed in the President's hands. The distinction between insurrection and war was more than a lawyer's quibble; for by the adoption of the insurrectionary theory, the President independently put into play all the enginery of war without consulting Congress.

It was thus that the "dictatorship" began. A definite course of action was inaugurated while Congress was in recess; and as if to emphasize this presidential monopoly of emergency powers, the date for the assembling of Congress was placed at July 4, though the call was issued on April 15. In the interval between April and July various measures besides the calling of the militia were taken on purely executive authority. The President, for instance, declared a blockade of Southern ports, thus inadvertently bringing the international law of neutrality and the principle of Confederate belligerency (which he had refused to recognize) to bear upon the situation. He expanded the regular army purely on his own authority. Whereas the call of April 15 was a summoning of the militia, which the President has a right to call for the suppression of insurrection, a further call of May 3 was an appeal for recruits to the regular army beyond the total then authorized by law. Increasing the regular army is a congressional function. "I never met any one," said John Sherman, "who claimed that the President could, by proclamation, increase the regular army." The rush of patriotic activity, however, left no time for deliberation as to legal au-

thority; and Lincoln did not wait to satisfy himself whether this action was constitutionally authorized. In fact, he even admitted his doubt as to its legality. "These measures," he said, in his message of July 4, 1861, "whether strictly legal or not, were ventured upon under what appeared to be a popular demand and a public necessity; trusting . . . that Congress would readily ratify them." There is much more to be said concerning Lincoln's relations with Congress; but this phase of his policy suggests the dictator's typical attitude toward a legislature as a set of men to meet and "ratify" executive measures that have been irrevocably taken. This confronting of Congress with a *fait accompli* was, in the opinion of four dissenting justices of the Supreme Court, carried too far. They expressed the belief in the *Prize Cases* that the President's power of suppressing an insurrection is not tantamount to the war power, and that even a civil war does not legally begin until recognized by act of Congress. The court as a whole upheld the President in the *Prize Cases*, holding that he had but done his duty in resisting a war that was thrust upon the government, and Congress did ratify his acts; but according to the dissenting justices war did not legally begin in April with proclamations concerning the militia and the blockade, but on July 13, 1861, when Congress passed a resolution recognizing a state of war.

Other examples reveal Lincoln's tendency to expand the executive authority. Early in the war he gave large powers unofficially to certain citizens who were to make arrangements for transporting troops and supplies and otherwise promoting the public defense. Doubting the loyalty of certain persons in the government departments, he directed the Secretary of the Treasury to advance two million dollars of public money without security to John A. Dix, George Opdyke, and Richard H. Bathford of New York, to pay the expenses of certain "military and naval measures necessary for the defense and support of the Government." Yet the Constitution provides that "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law." Again Lincoln confessed the irregularity of his act, saying he was not

aware that a dollar of the public funds "thus confided without authority of law to unofficial persons" was lost or wasted. In Lincoln's mind the honesty of his act seemed to excuse its illegality. But the whole principle of constitutional government supposes that orderly rule depends upon fixed legal guarantees and limitations, not upon the variable factor of a ruler's personality. This is the kernel of truth contained in that misunderstood maxim that we are under "a government of laws, not of men."

That measure of Lincoln's which was most obviously suggestive of dictatorship was his suspension of the *habeas corpus* privilege. Prior to September, 1862, this suspension had been of limited application; but in this month the President issued a proclamation of general scope by which the privilege was denied to "all rebels and insurgents, their aiders and abettors . . . and all persons discouraging . . . enlistments, resisting . . . drafts, or guilty of any disloyal practices." Such persons were, by this proclamation, made "subject to martial law, and liable to trial and punishment by courts martial or military commissions." Thousands were arrested on suspicion by executive order and held for varying periods in military confinement for unspecified offenses, being denied access to the courts for examination of the facts and the judicial merits of their cases. Disloyal activity in the North made these arrests seem to the President necessary; but his action gave color to the charge of dictatorship which his opponents continually urged. By proclamation, they said, he was taking congressional power; and by denying the *habeas corpus* privilege he made himself independent of the courts. Old Capitol Prison, Fort Warren, Fort Lafayette, and other military prisons were referred to as "American Bastilles"; and the President's orders for arrest were compared to the *lettres de cachet* of French monarchs. The arrests, though usually made by military officers under the administration of a Cabinet secretary, were in law the President's acts; and Lincoln's own order for the arrest of a specified individual is not unknown. The system in force permitted him to do this whenever he wished.

To dwell upon further examples of Lincoln's executive acts would carry us to undue length. By his order or under his authority martial law was at times proclaimed; men were drafted into the army before Congress had enacted the conscription law; newspapers were occasionally suppressed; editors were imprisoned; slaves were declared free in "rebellious" districts; and tribunals hitherto unknown to American law, called "special war courts", were established. As to reconstruction, where Lincoln showed a magnanimity of which Congress was incapable, a most unusual sweep of authority was assumed; for the President took to himself the function of restoring the states of the South to the Union and of directing their government pending the completion of such restoration. Since in these unusual measures the President often grasped legislative and judicial as well as executive powers, it looked as though one man had largely become, in the words of one of the lawyers of the period, "the impersonation of the country."

II

With all this extraordinary power that Lincoln wielded, we somehow do not think of him as a dictator. May this not be explained in part by the way in which he used his authority? At any rate that is a side of the question which merits close study; for where terrible weapons are held by one man, the disposition of that man is a matter of importance. Had Lincoln's powers been grasped by a typical war lord instead of the prairie lawyer and swapper of stories, the event would have been far different. In this connection it is instructive to study the most prominent of the wartime cases involving the suspension of civil liberties—that of Clement L. Vallandigham, a vigorous anti-war agitator, whose name was a slogan for thousands of Lincoln's opponents and in whose case the whole movement for constitutional guarantees was focused. On May 1, 1863, Vallandigham made a violent speech at Mount Vernon, Ohio, asserting that the war could easily have been concluded by negotiation or by the acceptance of French mediation, but that the administration was need-

lessly prolonging the bloodshed. The war, he said, was not for the Union but for the liberation of the blacks and the enslavement of the whites; and he spoke with contempt of General Burnside's order threatening punishment for treasonable utterances. Vallandigham was placed under military arrest, which enhanced his importance; was deprived of the *habeas corpus* privilege; was denied a trial in the regular courts; and was condemned by a military commission to imprisonment during the war.

Lincoln was embarrassed. There were thousands of Vallandighams, and in merely expressing disloyalty (if it amounted to that) they were violating no law; for legally treason is a matter of acts, not words. Severe treatment of such men would but help their cause. The President and all the Cabinet regretted Burnside's hasty act in making the arrest; but the Administration had to guard against a hasty release that might be interpreted as weakness. In this dilemma Lincoln's sense of humor—a quality no dictator should have—offered a solution; and he commuted Vallandigham's sentence to banishment within the Confederate lines.

From this point, by turning the pages of Vallandigham's voluminous biography (written by his brother), we read of the exile's ride under military escort to the Confederate outposts; his "proposition" to General Rosecrans that he be allowed to address the Union soldiers who would be moved by his words to "tear Lincoln to pieces"; his nomination for the governorship of Ohio on the Democratic ticket; his escape to Canada after a dash through the blockade; his sojourn among admirers at Windsor; his addresses "to the people" in which he rebuked the "weak despots at Washington"; his elaborate reply to visiting students from the University of Michigan (one wonders whether the students did not regard the affair as a lark); and his determination to "recover his liberties, or perish in the attempt." Under a Falstaffian disguise, aided by a thick mustache and a large pillow, he returned to the United States. Then he threw off the disguise and participated prominently in the screaming campaign of 1864. After this return from Elba his speeches were as violent as before;

but here again Lincoln's sense of humor allowed Vallandigham to go unmolested, though the terms of the banishment involved reimprisonment in case of return.

The Vallandigham case was a familiar text for those who denounced the Lincoln Government; yet it shows in Lincoln himself a lenient attitude in the face of a set of conditions which offered a plausible justification for much more severe treatment. The case brings into view a menacing opposition laboring to break that morale which alone can sustain armies in the field, and it shows a general and a military commission eager to apply repressive measures; but what is more significant, it reveals a patient President, careful of civil rights, lenient toward political opponents, and aware of the ultimate ineffectiveness of governmental force in dealing with matters of opinion.

III

Lincoln defended his extra-legal measures in his message to Congress and in carefully prepared replies to protesting citizens, particularly in his message of July 4, 1861, his "Birchard letter," and the "Corning letter", for it was Lincoln's manner to treat the opposition with respect. There was no "White House spokesman" and the presidential publicity of that period took the form of occasional letters directed to particular men, but intended for the nation's ear. Lincoln argued the desperateness of the emergency which he thought would justify acts "otherwise illegal"; he invoked the war powers which he conceived to be vested in the President more than in Congress (it was under this power that he freed the slaves); and he pointed to the inability of courts of justice to deal with organized rebellion. When a certain meeting protested against the arrest of an agitator and yet professed loyalty to the Government in its prosecution of the war, Lincoln cleverly countered by showing that suppression of the "rebellion" by military force required inflicting the death penalty upon deserters. He then asked: "Must I shoot a simple-minded soldier boy who deserts, while I must not touch a hair of a wily agitator who induces him to desert?"

The Government's use of summary process, Lincoln showed, was not for partisan advantage, not even for punishment, but for precautionary purposes. While showing that criminal prosecutions in the courts were meant for quiet times and intended primarily as punishments for deeds already committed, the arrests in cases of rebellion, he said, were made "not so much for what had been done, as for what probably would be done." The purpose, he explained, was "preventive", not "vindictive."

It was in this spirit that Lincoln's "arbitrary" measures were taken. The courts were doing almost nothing in the punishment of disloyalty. Indictments for treason, conspiracy, obstructing the draft, and like offenses, were sometimes brought by zealous grand juries; but the typical procedure in dealing with such indictments was to keep them on the docket from term to term, the offenders meanwhile being free on recognizance, and after a time the indictments were almost invariably dropped. No life was forfeited and no sentence of fine and imprisonment carried out in any judicial prosecution for treason arising out of the "rebellion."

Courts, it must be remembered, do not automatically enforce the law. It is rather the manner in which the courts are used by the executive department that determines the extent of criminal punishment. If the Government's prosecutors—the district attorneys acting under the President through the Attorney General—are lukewarm in promoting prosecutions, convictions will be few; and this lukewarmness was decidedly manifest in the Lincoln administration. The administration knew very well that success in such a highly technical proceeding as treason would be difficult to obtain, especially in a community sympathetic to the accused; and it also knew that the Government's success in such cases, by rendering the victim a martyr, might be even more embarrassing than failure.

The purpose of the Lincoln government was not to punish any individuals for treason or disloyalty. Its purpose was to detain citizens suspected of actively promoting the enemy's cause, to hold them for a time in confinement, and then to

release them on promise of good behavior. In his very arbitrariness Lincoln was lenient. Easy release was an essential feature of his system. His releases, in fact, were as arbitrary as the arrests. To have prosecuted cases of disloyalty with vigor in the courts, assuming the existence of adequate laws for such prosecution, would have resulted in fines and prison terms under judicial sentences; whereas by summary methods, the immediate object—protection against the consequences of too flagrant disloyalty—was accomplished at once, and yet the administration was free to release the political prisoners at any time. Summary methods, used by a Lincoln, are less severe than regular judicial process. Though we need not justify arbitrary arrest and military imprisonment on this ground, yet in explaining Lincoln's preference for such measures, this phase of the matter deserves attention.

Lincoln, though a lawyer, was not legalistic. The human element in a situation always appealed to him more than the abstract legal principle. His attitude toward conscientious objectors illustrates this point. In the letter to Mrs. Gurney, wife of a Quaker minister, one sees a fine sympathy for the Quakers; and when a certain Vermont Quaker named Pringle refused military service though drafted, and stood his ground like a martyr, Lincoln directed that the man be sent home. Military discipline would have called for an unbending enforcement of orders in the imprisonment of this serene Quaker, though it could never have made a soldier of him; but Lincoln, though not a weak sentimentalist, was constantly calling for discretion and moderation in the use of military power. Later in the war objectors on religious grounds were given by act of Congress the option of non-combatant service.

IV

In seeking a just historical appraisal of Lincoln's methods of rule it may be instructive to view them first in their American setting, and then to enlarge the perspective by comparing them with executive methods in other countries. One must avoid dogmatizing as to what is, and what is not, "American." It is a common American fault to shut our eyes to the inade-

quate and inefficient features of our government and to make shallow comparisons which assume a superiority in our system over any other in the world; and it is also a common fault of a democracy to assume a superiority over every monarchy. Matters of politics are not so simple as that, and it is even difficult to define democracy and to indicate where particular countries should be classified as to their democratic or non-democratic character. It is, however, possible to show that certain nations have been used to the ways of repressive government, and it requires no unusual discernment to distinguish between the normal reactions of a citizen in such a country and those of the typical American. There are nations in which force, government by fear, permanent conscription, censorship, suppression of opinion, and martial law, are taken for granted. Constitutional rights, in such a state, are conceived as the gift of the sovereign to his subjects; and government is regarded as master of the people. The individual is thought of as existing only for the state; and to the unthinking citizen the state means the government. In a government of this type the direction of the nation's forces can be so artificially motivated that the nation ceases to "be itself"; and under such circumstances we sometimes speak of a "nation gone mad". Military power, under the type of government we have been describing, is conceived as superior to the civil power. "Necessity knows no law," "inter arma silent leges," are the maxims with which such a government justifies the principle of unrestrained military force. Before the Great War von der Goltz wrote thus: "Accustomed as we are to the . . . ruthless employment of force, we might almost believe that war and military institutions had worn these natural features from time immemorial. Yet both were always much dependent upon the state of universal civilization, yes even upon theories, upon the views of right and wrong, and the prejudices of the times. The simple conception of military operations which obtains today, namely, that war, where necessary, revokes all rights incidental to a state of peace, did not obtain in former generations."¹

¹ *The Nation in Arms*, p. 1.

There is a real and not merely a seeming contrast between this conception and that which has prevailed in America. The American (if one may generalize roughly on the basis of our whole history) cares more for living safely than for living dangerously. Government, to him, is not master, but servant. Even the government itself is under the "rule of law"; and for illegal acts and unwarranted infringements upon private rights he considers that governmental officers are personally liable. Individual rights, he believes, do not derive from a constitution; much less are they granted from above. Instead, they inherently exist; and the function of a constitution is so to limit the government that these rights will be protected. Military power, in the American view, is subordinate, even in war, to the civil power. The maxim "necessity knows no law" (often a mere excuse for military usurpation) appears as no better than a half-truth; and even amid arms it is maintained that a civilized government will subject its military power to such restraints as are to be found in the laws of warfare, in treaty obligations, and in those civil guarantees which belong to the nation's citizens and to non-combatants under military occupation. Our Supreme Court, in one of its most important decisions held that "the Constitution . . . is . . . law . . . equally in war and in peace," and that in districts where Federal courts are unopposed, the trial by military commission of a citizen unconnected with the military service is illegal.²

Martial law, which Sir Matthew Hale referred to as "not a law, but something indulged . . . as a law," has been employed but rarely in this country, its employment by the Federal government being quite unusual. Though one may note a recent tendency to employ martial law in certain labor disputes within the states, as in West Virginia and Colorado, this is at variance with the main trend of American legal tradition. Under Washington judicial process was respected during the Whiskey Insurrection; and the civil courts functioned regularly at the time of the Burr conspiracy when General Wilkinson's prisoners were released on *habeas corpus* writs. For General Jackson's excess of zeal in suppressing

² *Ex parte Milligan*, 71 U. S. 2.

judicial procedure in the War of 1812, a fine of one thousand dollars was imposed; and the authority of regular courts over a military commander was thus vindicated. American precedents were strongly against militaristic measures at the time of Lincoln's presidency; and this may help to explain the vociferous objections to Lincoln's methods of rule.

Holding in mind this American repugnance to irregular executive measures and this preference for constitutional procedures, and recalling the sweeping proclamations and executive orders which Lincoln issued (decreing martial law, arbitrary arrest, emancipation of slaves, and many other unwonted things), we must admit that he stretched his constitutional powers. Viewed in its American setting, then, and in relation to the preceding seventy-odd years under the Constitution, it appears that the Lincoln administration was departing from established precedents. To say that Lincoln regretted this and that he was solicitous to preserve constitutional restraints, is not to refute the fact. Infraction of the Constitution was one of the many unfortunate concomitants of civil war.

Yet even here we should remember that, amid the war psychology of the 'sixties, Lincoln would have found congressional and popular support in considerable degree for more drastic action than he actually took. Not every one attacked the "dictatorship": there were many who urged the administration to even more severe measures. When Wendell Phillips denounced Lincoln, it was usually for weakness and vacillation; and he even spoke approvingly of "despotic" acts. The Government, he said, had neither vigor nor purpose, but drifted with events. Lincoln he characterized as a "first rate *second rate man*"; yet in referring to the use of large war powers, he said that a democratic government "may safely be trusted, in a great emergency, with despotic power without fear of harm or of wrecking the state." As for Congress, it ratified the President's acts, declared his suspension of the *habeas corpus* privilege to be "authorized," and showed its own teeth by extreme measures of which Lincoln disapproved, such as the confiscation of "rebel" property. Moreover, Congress, in its attempt to force a reorganization of Lincoln's

Cabinet in December, 1862 (when a senatorial caucus encouraged the Chase faction and demanded Seward's resignation), and in its assumption of military control through its "Committee on the Conduct of the War," seemed in the mood for a dictatorship of its own. And the worst dictatorship our country has ever known was the dictatorship of Congress during reconstruction. Better a dictatorship of a Lincoln than that of a Sumner, a Stevens, or a Wade.

V

When viewed in a larger setting, and in comparison with dictatorships abroad, the irregularities and extra-legal procedures of the Lincoln administration bear a milder appearance. In this day of reactionary and repressive governments the impulse for ruling dangerously, and the strong-man idea, are painfully familiar; and the people of the present generation have suffered disillusionment as to democracy itself. Today the word "dictator" is read with a new connotation. This may be illustrated by putting the question as to how a dictator of the twentieth-century type, if placed in Lincoln's position, would have dealt with Vallandigham. Speaking of extra-legal measures, would the agitator not have been extra-legally crippled, if not actually murdered? Dictatorships of today are accused of such methods. At least Vallandigham's right to speak and publish his views would have been denied. Furthermore, if present-day styles had been in vogue, his whole party would have been suppressed, its right to representation in Congress withheld, its meetings prohibited, and its newspapers destroyed.

Lincoln's practice, indeed, fell very far short of a thorough-going dictatorship. He did not pack his legislature, nor eject his opposition. There was no military "purging" of Congress,—nothing analogous to Cromwell's Rump Parliament. Elections were not forced or controlled as under Diaz of Mexico, though military "protection" was in some few cases supplied. There was no Lincoln party constituting a super-state and visiting vengeance upon political opponents. Criminal violence was not employed *sub rosa* after the fashion of

modern dictatorships. There was no juggling of representation so as to give the dominant party an artificial majority as in Fascist Italy; nor was there any parallel to the methods of Bismarck who suppressed parliamentary government in Prussia from 1862 to 1866, forcing through a military program against the opposition of the Reichstag. Lincoln encountered great hostility in Congress, especially in the Senate (what President has not had a Senate "on his hands"?); and he must often have sighed for a legislative recess. Anti-Lincoln Republicans were numerous, not to mention the Democrats; and it was once said that there were only two Lincoln men in the House. Stephenson, in his illuminating biography of Lincoln, writes of the dominant Republicans in Congress as "the Jacobins" and of the Democrats as the "Little Men"; and between them these two elements allowed Lincoln few peaceful moments. Sometimes the opposition of senators reached the point of open defiance, as in connection with the Wade-Davis Reconstruction bill of 1864. Yet one finds in Lincoln's attitude toward the men "on the hill" little of the dictator's manner, and much of tactful conciliation and even at times a yielding to the point of surrendering his own views. Though, as we have noted, Lincoln anticipated congressional action by assuming powers and then seeking a retroactive authorization from Congress (which is a practice that could hardly be justified under our system of government), yet he never thought of coercing Congress into passing a ratifying measure.

Lincoln's attitude toward freedom of thought was not that of a dictator. When the *Chicago Times* was suspended by General Burnside's order, Lincoln promptly revoked that order; and though there were various other instances of repressive action against newspapers, yet repression was not the general policy. When General Schofield brought about the arrest of a Democratic editor in Missouri, Lincoln sent a telegram expressing regret for such action; and to the same general, on another occasion, he sent an order as follows: "You will only arrest individuals and suppress assemblies or newspapers when they may be working palpable injury to the

military in your charge, and in no other case will you interfere with the expression of opinion in any form or allow it to be interfered with violently by others. In this you have a discretion to exercise with great caution, calmness and forbearance." There was no Sedition Act during the Civil War; and one needs only to read the abusive outpourings of Wendell Phillips—to say nothing of more rabid agitators—to realize that the citizen was free to speak his mind against the government, far more so than during the World War.

Unlike the typical dictator, Lincoln submitted to election by the people. The congressional election of 1862 went so heavily against the administration that it has been called a vote of lack of confidence. The President had formulated the intention, if the people should have chosen McClellan in 1864, to take every measure of coöperation with the President-elect between the election and the inauguration. The resolution which he made on this subject was confided to the Cabinet and was thus made a matter of record. Had McClellan been elected, Lincoln intended to call him in and say: "General, the election has demonstrated that you are stronger, have more influence with the American people than I. Now let us together, you with your influence and I with all the executive power of the government, try to save the country."

Very unlike the dictator's tone was this note of submission to popular election, this generous offer of assistance to a rival who had supplanted him.

VI

That democracy should produce dictatorships offers a familiar topic for cynics; yet in going over his writings one finds that Lincoln conceived of his own rule as a saving of democracy. The cause for which he contended he envisaged as the vindication of popular government in the world. He once said to John Hay, "I consider the central idea pervading this struggle is the necessity . . . of proving that popular government is not an absurdity." Again he said, referring to disunion: "And this issue embraces more than the fate of these United States. It presents to the whole family of man

the question whether a constitutional republic, or democracy—a government of the people by the same people—can or cannot maintain its territorial integrity against its own domestic foes . . . It forces us to ask: 'Is there in all republics this inherent and fatal weakness?' Must a government, of necessity, be too strong for the liberties of its own people, or too weak to maintain its own existence?" The unusual measures he used were to preserve the nation and to preserve democracy in the world. They were like the surgeon's knife, he said, which cuts in order to save. The dictator of today, on the contrary, flouts democracy, and abandons even the pretense of adherence to the democratic faith.

The time to judge the democratic principle is not during war and revolution, nor during the reactionary period that comes in the aftermath of war. If we always have war, perhaps we may despair of democracy, for autocracy shows strongest in abnormal times. Dictatorships are like the quick heartbeat of fever; but democratic rule more resembles the steady pulse of health.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE SAAR

HAROLD G. VILLARD

New York City

I

WHEN THE Versailles Peace Treaty detached what is known as the Saar Territory from Germany and placed the direction of the affairs of that highly industrialized and densely populated region in the hands of the League of Nations, it was in the power of that newly created organization to establish a model government for the area entrusted to its charge. Instead of availing itself of the opportunity thus presented and winning the good will of the inhabitants, its course from the very start has been such as to arouse their opposition and distrust.

In order to understand the antagonism felt by the Saar people towards the League it is first of all necessary to recall the circumstances under which they were separated from their German fellow citizens and subjected to an alien rule against their protests. By the terms of peace,¹ in which the inhabitants directly affected were allowed no voice, the League was given a mandate to govern "in the capacity of trustee" for a period of fifteen years, when a plebiscite is to be held, certain parts of Prussia and Bavaria adjacent to the Saar River, which were united to form the existing Saar Territory. In the place of Germany's renounced sovereignty the government of this tract was entrusted to a commission, consisting of five members, with autocratic powers, representing the League of Nations. In addition, as compensation for the destruction during the hostilities of the coal mines in Northern France, the absolute ownership of the coal deposits in the Saar region was transferred from the German to the French Government, to which broad powers and rights were also granted in connection with their working.

This determination of their destiny was regarded by the residents of the Saar Territory as unjust and morally indefen-

¹ Versailles Peace Treaty, Section IV.

sible. The mines in the North of France were merely damaged, not destroyed, and from 1925 on have produced a greater tonnage than before the World War.² Yet because of the temporary reduction in the output of these coal mines those living in the Saar were subjected, in this supposedly democratic age, to a foreign and despotic regime without being given an opportunity to express their views. Although President Wilson had laid down the doctrine that peoples were "not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and tools in the game",³ the Allied and Associated Powers in disposing of the Saar inhabitants at Versailles followed the opposite view of the American expert in these negotiations⁴ that "the control of key deposits of minerals by a small population,⁵ which happens to lie over them, is not a necessary part of the principles of self-determination."

The Saar residents have always been fully aware that their subjection to a foreign yoke because they happened to dwell in a richly endowed mineral area⁶ was directly contrary to the Wilsonian thesis that "governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed." This striking infringement of a people's right to self-determination was agreed to by President Wilson primarily in order to secure the adoption of the League of Nations Covenant to the Versailles Peace Treaty. He was also probably impressed by the French contention, upheld throughout the preliminary negotiations, that the Saar Territory was inhabited by a mixed population with divided sentiments. "There are in this region," President Clemenceau told him, "150,000 Frenchmen," who had "also a right to justice."⁷

This statement was entirely unfounded, as the most cursory investigation would have shown. The Saar possesses a rarely homogeneous population, which is German to the core. A census taken in 1910 in the Prussian parts of the present

² 28,730 millions of tons in 1925, as against 27,391 millions in 1913.

³ Address to Congress, Feb. 11, 1918.

⁴ Professor C. H. Haskins.

⁵ Approximately 750,000 in the case of the Saar.

⁶ With coal reserves exceeding 12 billions of tons.

⁷ A. Tardieu, *La Paix*, p. 293.

Saar Territory showed that only 339 out of 572,112 inhabitants had learned French as their mother tongue, while those using the German language comprised 99.36 per cent. of the total population.⁸ Despite the influx of French officials and workmen since 1920, the people are still almost purely German. When given an opportunity to express their sentiments at the time of the 1924 elections to the Saar Advisory Council, 248,576 or 97.3 per cent. out of 254,858 voters cast their ballots for the German parties. In the same year only 748 French speaking children were attending the schools established by the French mining authorities.⁹

II

Accepting as true the French assumption that a population of divided sentiments was involved, the makers of the Versailles Peace Treaty directed that the people of the Saar region should indicate by a plebiscite, to be held in 1935, their wish, whether they desired to be governed permanently by the League of Nations, to be united to France, or to be reincorporated in the German Reich. In the Saar this future plebiscite is regarded as a useless formality and as an unnecessary expense. The Saar people have repeatedly shown their preference by electing solidly return-to-Germany delegations to the local Advisory Council. The League has obtained no support worth mentioning, since the maintenance of its present regime would mean the continuation of a government by foreigners neither responsible to, nor nominated by, the Saar inhabitants.

Pending the holding of this plebiscite, the Peace Treaty entrusted the League of Nations with a double function. It was to govern the Saar Territory with due regard to the welfare of the population and, at the same time, to preserve certain extensive privileges given the French government in regard to the exploitation of the Saar coal mines. These included the subjection of the Saar Basin to the French customs regime, the right to circulate French money freely in

⁸ *Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich*, 1927, p. 10.

⁹ *Current History*, Vol. 21, p. 538.

that area, and the power to establish French schools for the children of French speaking mine employees. These provisions gave France a favored position as compared with Germany, which was forbidden by the Treaty to engage in any direct activities in the Saar district.

In its capacity as trustee for the nation to which the sovereignty over the Saar would ultimately revert, it was incumbent on the League of Nations to observe strict impartiality between France and Germany, the two countries interested in the outcome of the plebiscite. Instead of endeavoring to hold the scales as evenly as possible, the Council of the League in February, 1920, appointed a Governing Commission with a pro-French majority consisting of a former French prefect, a Danish count long a resident of Paris, and a Belgian major. It made the French member, M. Victor Rault, the chairman of the Commission and the chief executive of the Saar Territory, a move not calculated to please the German speaking population which was still feeling the hardships of the French military occupation of its homeland.

The first act of the new chairman was to appoint a number of Frenchmen to high Government posts and to ask for the retention of the French troops. His next step was to issue an ordinance¹⁰ empowering the Commission to dispense with the services of disloyal or supernumerary Government employees. These proceedings caused great uneasiness among all classes. The officeholders felt that their right to retain their positions until removed on charges was endangered, while the populace regarded the appointment of non-German speaking aliens as contrary to the spirit of the Peace Treaty, which guaranteed the unrestricted use of their mother tongue in all private and public transactions.

In order to placate public opinion Chairman Rault promised not to remove officials wholesale and to appoint only Saar natives thereafter to all minor Government posts. But he further antagonized the public servants by refusing to modify the draft of a statute concerning their status which they felt curtailed certain of their rights. His unyielding attitude led

¹⁰ On March 16, 1920.

in August, 1920 to an unsuccessful strike of eight days duration by all Government employees, which the entire population sympathized with as an attempt to make a despotic regime respect old privileges. Instead of viewing the strike in this light, the majority of the Governing Commission treated it as an open rebellion and resorted immediately to stern measures. Although the stoppage of work was of very short duration¹¹ and was attended with almost no disturbances, martial law was proclaimed and the commander of the French garrison was instructed to maintain order. The latter promptly arrested and deported in a brutal fashion about one hundred leading citizens and caused others to be condemned by court martials. A large number of these last were afterwards pardoned by the French military authorities, while their list of expulsions was revised by President Rault.

III

At the outbreak of the strike Herr von Boch, the German member of the Governing Commission, resigned because he disapproved of the course of his colleagues. In a subsequent communication to the League of Nations he strongly urged that body to appoint an impartial delegation to inquire into the situation in the Saar Basin by consulting directly with representatives of all classes. At the next meeting of the Council of the League this request was ignored, together with two petitions from Saar inhabitants, on the ground that the Council had already decided¹² that all such petitions should be sent to the Saar Governing Commission, which was to return them later on to the Council, either with or without comment.

This procedure had the double effect of precluding the Saar natives from approaching the League of Nations directly for a redress of grievances and of preventing them from refuting any unjust comments made by the Governing Commission on their demands for reforms. It allowed the body whose shortcomings were complained of to pass upon the

¹¹ From August 6 to August 14, 1920.

¹² As early as May 15, 1920.

accusations made against it, while those who presented the charges were denied a hearing. This unfair attitude dashed the hopes of the Saar natives of obtaining justice from the League and arrayed them almost solidly against it.

Simultaneously with this ruling the Council of the League still further affronted public sentiment by electing as the Saar member of the Governing Commission a native medical practitioner with pro-French leanings instead of choosing a person acceptable to the bulk of the inhabitants. This physician was subsequently twice reelected by the Council over many protests and remained in office until it was proven that he had been in almost treasonable correspondence with President Clemenceau during the French military occupation of the Saar Basin. His compulsory retirement was a great blow to the prestige of the League, which was placed in the position of having made a renegade native devoted to French interests the representative of the Saar people in the Governing Commission. It was not until 1924 that the League appointed as the Saar member one who possessed the confidence of the inhabitants and who could truly voice their sentiments.

Other events strengthened the impression prevalent at this time in the Saar that the League of Nations had made of the Governing Commission an instrument for the furtherance of French interests. On July 7, 1920 the Commission, which was required by the Peace Treaty to look after the interests of Saar natives abroad, voted to entrust France with this duty, on the ground that the heavy expense involved prevented the Saar Territory from establishing its own diplomatic and consular service. This decree added to the Commission's unpopularity because it placed under the protection of France persons who were German citizens. Yet the Peace Treaty reads that its provisions shall "not affect the existing nationality" of the Saar inhabitants, who considered it a hardship that they, who spoke German, should have to apply when abroad to French diplomatic representatives, with whose language they were unfamiliar. In this instance the Commission could have avoided the charge of being pro-French by simply asking the neutral Swiss Government, all of whose consuls know German, to act for the Saar people in foreign lands.

But what especially stirred public opinion against the Governing Commission was its course in regard to the schools, which the Peace Treaty allowed the French Government to establish for the children of its mine employees. As instruction could be given in French in these schools, it was taken for granted in the Saar that only French speaking children would attend them. As early as July 10, 1920, however, the Commission issued two decrees throwing these schools open to the children of the German speaking personnel of the French Mines Administration and of other Saar inhabitants as well. Thereafter the official French schools began to give instruction in German and were accused of enticing German children to them by threats and pressure of various sorts.

There ensued a competition for pupils between the German State schools and the French Mines schools with an attendant outburst of popular feeling against the Commission. This was reproached with having infringed the clause of the Peace Treaty guaranteeing to the inhabitants the retention of their existing school system and with seeking to influence the outcome of the future plebiscite by fostering French educational centers engaged in political propaganda. When appealed to for redress the League of Nations decided to take no action in the premises.¹³ There was really no need for the Governing Commission to have gone out of its way to raise this tempest about the schools. No demand of importance has ever existed in the Saar for bi-lingual teaching, as is evidenced by the fact that not one school child out of thirty is attending the French schools.¹⁴

The Governing Commission next incurred the enmity of the devout population by vainly seeking through the French Ambassador at the Vatican the appointment of an apostolic delegate for the Saar and the separation of that territory from the bishoprics of Trier and Speyer, to which it has been attached for centuries. This attempted interference with the religious status quo was quite uncalled for and aligned the clergy solidly against the Commission. Much more serious

¹³ On December 11, 1924.

¹⁴ *Current History*, Vol. 21, p. 538.

was its subsequent endeavors to suppress freedom of speech in the Saar.

IV

From the very beginning President Rault took the position that no views were to be expressed which were likely to excite public opinion or to undermine the authority of the Governing Commission. All anti-French or pro-German sentiments had to be suppressed else the outcome of the plebiscite might be influenced. Besides, as the French member of the Governing Commission, he felt it his especial duty "to defend French interests"¹⁶ on every occasion.

In the early part of 1923 a strike of the Saar miners occurred for higher pay, which lasted for 100 days¹⁶ and which "ended without a single incident." The Franco-Belgian invasion of the Ruhr district was then in progress and an indignation meeting had been held before the administrative offices of the French State Mines. The Saar press published violent anti-French articles "with most insulting headlines." Deeming it absolutely necessary to prevent the recurrence of a protest meeting and finding "it impossible to tolerate such violence on the part of the press," President Rault on his own initiative, and after consulting with only one of his colleagues, on March 7, 1923 issued a provisional decree for the maintenance of public order and security.

Among other drastic provisions this short lived decree authorized the prohibition in advance of meetings, processions and demonstrations, the suppression of newspapers and periodicals and made persons who cast discredit on the Treaty of Versailles or who insulted the League of Nations, its members or the Governing Commission, liable to imprisonment for a period not exceeding five years.¹⁷ As nothing had occurred to disturb public tranquility there was no special occasion for the promulgation of this decree and it was only put into effect to the extent of suspending the publications of four newspapers for short periods. Already on June 18, 1923 it was

¹⁶ These and the following words in quotes are Rault's own.

¹⁷ From Feb. 5 to May 15, 1923.

¹⁸ League of Nations, *Official Journal*, 1923, p. 421.

replaced by a milder decree. Nevertheless the original decree of March 7, had created so much unfavorable comment that the Council of the League of Nations, at the instance of Lord Robert Cecil and against the opposition of France, held an inquiry in the ensuing July into the administration of the Saar Basin, at which no representatives of the inhabitants but only the members of the Governing Commission were heard. This one-sided investigation proved barren of results. At its conclusion the Council passed a resolution assuring the Commission of its whole hearted support, while President Rault, who according to his own confession had failed to win the confidence of either the Saar people or the press, was continued as the chief executive of the Territory for some years longer. By retaining in office so unpopular an individual, who neither spoke nor read German, the Council helped to keep alive the existing tension between the Saar natives and the Governing Commission.

The Council was really strongly obligated to listen to oral protests of the inhabitants because the League had refused its wards in the Saar any effective voice in the government on the ground that this was forbidden by the Peace Treaty. As the Treaty required the elected representatives of the people to be consulted before changes could be made in taxes or in existing laws the Governing Commission in March, 1922 constituted by decree an Advisory Council of 30 members to be elected by popular vote. This body is not even permitted to name its own chairman and during its sessions its members are liable to arrest.¹⁸ Furthermore, the Advisory Council can initiate no legislation and can only discuss and make recommendations in regard to such matters as the Governing Commission chooses to submit to it. Nor can the Council vote upon the so-called budget laid before it, which consists merely of a statement of anticipated receipts and expenditures. The League of Nation's Saar regime is unique in that it alone, of all civilized governments, possesses the exclusive right to levy taxes without having to account to a legislative body for the

¹⁸ The latest occurrence of this kind was at the May, 1928 session when two Communist members were seized by the police.

way in which it has expended the monies that have passed through its hands.

The Advisory Council is simply a shadowy parliament whose only function is to give an opinion on the proposed decrees of the Governing Commission, to which the latter body need pay no attention. Thus although the Advisory Council had voted against the elimination of the German mark, the Commission on May 18, 1923 promulgated a decree making the French franc the sole legal currency in the Saar Basin. In taking this action the Commission not only overrode the wish of the people's representatives, but also did a grave economic injury to the Saar population, as will be next explained.

V

Among other provisions the Peace Treaty provides that French money shall circulate unrestrictedly in the Saar Territory and that the French Mines Administration may pay its mine employees in French francs. Beginning with July 1, 1920 this right was availed of, despite the opposition of all the other industries and of the vast majority of the population.¹⁹ Four months later the metal works, which by that time were mostly controlled by French capital, commenced to pay wages in francs. The tendency was for the franc to gradually replace the mark as it was the more stable currency and less subject to depreciation.

As a supposedly impartial body the Governing Commission might well have abstained from intervening in this struggle for supremacy between the two currencies, which was going against the mark. In place of remaining neutral, however, the Commission hastened the general use of French money by issuing a decree, against the vote of those employed in the main branch affected,²⁰ which introduced the use of the franc in the Government railway and postal services as from May 1, 1921. By the following August teachers and all other Government officials were being paid in francs and on June 1, 1923 the Commission did away with the dual currency system by

¹⁹ Third Report, *Saar Governing Commission*, I 3. In the Christian Unions comprising 3/7 of all the miners the vote against the franc was unanimous.

²⁰ 11,467 railway employees voted for and 4,315 against the retention of the mark.

forbidding under severe penalties the further use of the mark in daily business transactions.

In this way the monetary unit in the Saar Territory was changed from the mark to the franc against the desire of the inhabitants and the protest of the German Government to the League of Nations. The Council of the League accepted the Governing Commission's viewpoint that the criticized monetary decrees were legal because the Commission was "fully convinced" of its right to issue them while its interpretation, in turn, of its powers under the Saar provisions of the Peace Treaty was binding upon everyone. This logical line of reasoning makes the Commission a law unto itself. It issues decrees and then passes upon their validity. Appeals from its decisions are unavailing, as the League has never overruled the Commission's stand on any question.

In eliminating the mark the Commission furthered French economic penetration of the Saar Basin, but did great harm to its trade and industry. For a stable currency was above all needed, which was not attained by the substitution of the steadily depreciating franc for the rapidly vanishing paper mark. Had the Commission kept its hands off the currency the Saar would have obtained such a stable currency at the close of 1923 when the German mark was restored to a gold basis, whereas the French franc underwent a great decline and was subject to violent fluctuations until the close of 1926.

The outlawing of the mark injured the Saar mercantile world in that it prevented the German Reichsbank from granting any further commercial credits to local firms. These had to contend with a credit shortage, as the Bank of France refused to step into the shoes of the Reichsbank and to discount Saar bills of exchange. This drawback the Governing Commission could have obviated by simply cancelling its decree against the mark, as was requested by the Saar Advisory Council in 1924. Its failure to allow the reintroduction of the mark at that time was taken in the Saar as positive proof that, in its handling of the currency problem, the Commission was more intent upon fastening France's economic hold upon the region than in protecting the welfare of the inhabitants.

Again, in determining for the first time in 1924 the contribution which the French State Mines were to pay towards the Saar Government's running expenses, the Commission favored the French fisc at the expense of the remaining Saar taxpayers. According to the Peace Treaty this quota was to be fixed "with due regard to the ratio of the value of the mines to the total taxable wealth of the Basin." In calculating this proportion the Commission valued the State Mines at 346 millions of marks and all other real and personal property at 1,147 millions. These two items added together give a total of 1,593 millions of marks of which approximately 22 per cent was ascribable to the State Mines. Instead of taking this as the correct percentage, the Commission arbitrarily swelled its estimate of the total taxable wealth by 838 millions of marks as "the value represented by labor."²¹ How this figure was arrived at has never been explained, but its inclusion reduced the State Mines' proportion of all expenses payable from almost one-fourth to about one-seventh. Hence by inserting a purely fictitious sum for labor in its schedule of taxable wealth the Commission lowered by one-third the taxes that would otherwise have been due from the French Mines Administration and raised those of the remaining tax-payers by one-tenth. In devising this arrangement, which is still in effect to-day, the Commission has helped to swell the profits of the French Treasury from the operation of the State coal mines to the detriment of the Saar people for whom it was acting as trustee.

VI

But what has convinced the native population most of all that French interests are always paramount with the League of Nations is the continued presence of French troops in the Saar Basin. In that territory all military service is forbidden by the Peace Treaty, which only permits the establishment of a local gendarmerie for the maintenance of order. Pending the creation of this force the League in February, 1920 authorized the Governing Commission to retain such part of the 10,000 French troops then occupying the Saar as were neces-

²¹ League of Nations, *Journal*, 1924, p. 1052.

sary to protect "persons and property". The billeting on the inhabitants of so many soldiers accentuated the existing housing shortage and increased the heavy financial burdens of the local communes.

These undoubted hardships could have been quickly done away with by a prompt replacement of the French soldiery by a local gendarmerie, which was what the Council of the League of Nations originally desired. On three separate occasions²² it passed resolutions calling for the speedy superseding of the foreign garrison. But its aim to free the Saar Basin from all alien military forces was thwarted by the Governing Commission under the leadership of Chairman Rault.

Owing to the repeated proddings of the German Government and the admonitions of the League, Chairman Rault could not delay the formation of the Saar constabulary indefinitely nor avert the withdrawal of the bulk of the French troops. Nevertheless, in consequence of his dilatory tactics, the recruiting of the local gendarmerie to its present full strength of 1,005 men took more than six years or until March, 1926 when Rault himself retired from office after he had vainly tried to prevent the inhabitants from expressing their loyalty to Germany on the occasion of the Rhineland Millenary celebration in the spring of 1925.

When the Saar gendarmerie had reached a strength of 1,005 men in the spring of 1926 the Governing Commission conceded that this force was sufficient to maintain order in normal times, but asked for permission to call in troops stationed outside the Saar Basin should a general strike or other grave emergency occur. In place of insisting then upon the withdrawal of the last two regiments of French troops for which there was no longer any need, the Council of the League allowed them to remain and asked the Governing Commission to report on the measures necessary "to insure, in all cases, freedom of transport and transit over the railways of the territory".

In accordance with a statement submitted by its then French Secretary-General as far back as March 3, 1922, the

²² June 20, 1921, Feb. 1, 1923 and July 7, 1923.

Commission advised the formation of a special railway defense corps of 800 men to safeguard communications between France and the occupied parts of Germany. This recommendation the League of Nations adopted. The remaining French troops were withdrawn in May, 1927, but were immediately replaced by a body of international railway police consisting mostly of Frenchmen with a sprinkling of Englishmen and Belgians.

In sanctioning the maintenance of an Allied armed force in the Saar Basin the League completely reversed its former position, namely, that the support of a foreign garrison was to be dispensed with as soon as possible. Nothing had occurred to warrant this change of attitude, as the Saar people are peaceable and not given to rioting or sabotage.²³ As no one has ever attempted to interfere with the movement of trains the railway police, of which there are three men to every mile of track, has absolutely nothing to do. The presence of this idle, predominately French force, owing allegiance to and paid by, alien governments ruffles the feelings of the inhabitants and serves no useful purpose.

VII

Under the trusteeship of the League of Nations the tax burdens of the Saar people are considerably higher than they would otherwise be. For a small country the existing form of government is a costly affair, as the five members of the Governing Commission draw salaries not much below those paid to German cabinet ministers. Then again, on account of the transitory nature of the present regime, the Saar Territory is unable to sell long time bonds like other governments. Even though permanent in character all local improvements have to be paid for out of current receipts instead of from the proceeds of a bond issue with payment spread over a term of years. Taxes in the Saar have therefore to be kept at a high level.

Besides, so long as the rule of the League of Nations continues, the Saar inhabitants cannot expect any great improve-

²³ League of Nations Journal 1923, p. 362.

ment in their present reduced earning capacity. While trade usually has been brisk owing to the fact that Germany allows the importation of nearly all Saar products free of duty, wages are so low in the Saar that the buying power of the great mass of the population is at a minimum. Indeed, economic conditions are so bad that the German government, although under no obligation to do so, is contributing annually ten millions of marks towards the relief of the near destitute in the territory. The blame for this widespread poverty is placed squarely upon the French Government. One half of all Saar manual laborers are employed in the French State coal mines and it is the compensation paid the mining force that determines the prevalent rate of wages. Under French management the mines are being exploited with a view to profit solely and wages are being purposely kept down to the lowest possible point.²⁴ As the Peace Treaty gives the French Government "complete liberty" in the working of the mines, the Governing Commission is unable to do anything towards bettering the status of the miners or raising the standard of living of the working class. The high prices exacted by the French Mines Administration for its coal output²⁵ prevents in turn Saar industrial establishments from raising the wages of their employees materially.

Although the Saar Territory is subjected to the French customs regime, Germany still remains the best customer for its products.²⁶ Southern Germany and Switzerland are the natural market for Saar coal, while two-thirds of the quota allotted to the Saar iron works by the Continental Steel Trust has to be placed in Germany. That country absorbs a higher percentage than any other land of the Saar Basin's exports of finished iron and steel products and the same is true of the output of the Saar glass industry. What Lloyd George terms the "the natural economic links" of the Saar regions are more with Germany than with France.

²⁴ In first quarter of 1928 \$1.47 per shift as against \$1.99 in the Ruhr district, *Glückauf*, 1928, pp. 864-5.

²⁵ In 1927 \$4.35 per ton as against \$3.55 per ton for Ruhr coal with more heat units.

²⁶ In the first half of 1928 exports to Germany and France were estimated at 675 and 600 millions of francs respectively.

VIII

In demanding that the Saar Territory be reincorporated with Germany, the inhabitants are actuated by self-interest as well as by feelings of attachment. In the future plebiscite set for 1935 French officials and mining personnel will be unable to participate, as the ballot will be confined to persons who were Saar residents and five years of age at the time of the signing of the Peace Treaty. Every indication points to an overwhelming vote in favor of Germany, which would then have the right to repurchase all the Saar coal mines from France.

Such being the case, the Saar people are agitating for an immediate plebiscite instead of one six years from now. Their elected representatives are asserting that ample time has elapsed to prove that the creation of the Saar State was based on false ethnological and economic considerations. The inhabitants are not of mixed blood but of purely German stock, while it is the German and not the French market that is of paramount importance for Saar commerce. Nothing is to be gained by postponing the assured outcome of the plebiscite, and the League of Nations should take the initiative in seeing that the wrong done the natives in severing them from their mother country be righted without further delay.

Although the League of Nations as now constituted has proven unequal to the task of governing the Saar Territory along the lines laid down by the makers of the Versailles Peace Treaty, it has shown no inclination to relinquish the control of that region before the time set for the plebiscite. So the Saar inhabitants seem destined to remain subject for some years longer to the League's regime, which, it must be admitted, violates every democratic principle.

BARRIE'S DUAL PERSONALITY

HOMER E. WOODBRIDGE

Middletown, Conn.

Critical doctors disagree about Sir James Barrie perhaps as violently as about any important living writer. The extremes of opinion may be suggested by two short quotations. Professor William Lyon Phelps expresses some of his enthusiasm as follows: "J. M. Barrie is the foremost English-writing dramatist of our time; and his plays, taken together, make the most important contribution to the English drama since Sheridan. He unites the chief qualities of his contemporaries, and yet . . . he is the most original of them all." The most intelligent attitude to take toward Barrie's plays, Professor Phelps thinks, is "unconditional surrender." Before we deliver up our critical arms, however, it may be wise to look at another opinion. Dr. Ludwig Lewisohn expresses part of his contempt for Barrie and his works as follows: "Barrie's imagination is as uncontrolled as his ideas are feeble and conventional. . . . His noisy stage successes have left him increasingly bare of scruple, of seriousness, of artistic and intellectual coherence." Dr. Lewisohn admits that Barrie still has "moments of literary charm and deftness and mellow grace." But he has become "a purveyor of sentimental comedy to the unthinking crowd," with "a triviality of soul that is as shameful as one hopes it is rare." "Spiritual triviality" is the right summary for him and his writings. Dr. Lewisohn's scorn of Barrie, in fact, is exceeded only by his contempt for any critic who ventures even to raise the question whether Barrie will have a permanent place in literature.

The truth must be somewhere between these polar opposites, but neither of them will help us much in finding it. Dr. Lewisohn's damnation of Barrie is as uncritical as Professor Phelps's deification of him. Lewisohn condemns the plays for the same reason Dr. Johnson condemned *Lycidas*; they do not fit into his critical theory. He judges by a stiff realistic foot-rule; he is incapable of seeing the fun in a game of "Let's pretend." With a kind of unyielding critical Puritanism, he

believes it is immoral to pretend, even for fun. Consequently, he is unable to enjoy romantic comedy, and in his heart he probably is as much exasperated by *As You Like It* as he is by *Mary Rose*. Professor Phelps, on the other hand, glorifies Barrie's plays because he likes romantic comedy, and enjoys using extravagant language about things he likes. The interesting question is, what is the real character, what are the real merits and defects, of an author who excites from intelligent readers outcries so contradictory?

In his rectorial address at St. Andrews, Barrie confessed a kind of duality in his nature. "M'Connachie," he said, ". . . is the name I give to the unruly half of myself; the writing half. . . . He is the fanciful half . . . he prefers to fly around on one wing." M'Connachie is romantic, whimsical, extravagant, sometimes sentimental. It was not quite accurate, however, to call him "the writing half"; the fact is that in many of Barrie's books he has exercised but partial control of the pen. From his earliest appearance he has had to struggle with another Barrie, who is a very different sort of person. This other self is a realist, with a power of keen and exact observation, a penetrating insight into things-as-they-are, and a distrust of fancy and pretending. Barrie's best books are the result of a balance of power and a fortunate collaboration between these two beings. In the later work M'Connachie has tended more and more to get the upper hand. When he assumes complete control, the result is sometimes charming, and sometimes merely grotesque and weak or flat.

Now the realist Barrie has been rather generally overlooked; it is M'Connachie generally who excites the praises of Barrie's admirers and the violence of his detractors. The first thing to do, therefore, if we wish to discover the true Barrie, is to recognize the realist in him. It will be convenient to begin by glancing at what is probably the least familiar part of his writing,—his criticism. The remarkable thing about this is its clear insight, its sharp discrimination, especially in the judgments of contemporaries. Take, for instance, the comments on Stevenson in *An Edinburgh Eleven* (1889), which are far more acute than Stevenson's often quoted judgment of

Barrie. "The key-note of all Mr. Stevenson's writings is his indifference, so far as his books are concerned, to the affairs of life and death on which other minds are chiefly set. . . . He is chiefly picturesque, and to those who want more than art for art's sake, never satisfying. . . . He will have to take existence a little more seriously—to weave broadcloth instead of lace." Or glance at the estimate of the young Kipling in *The Man from Nowhere*; Barrie praises Kipling's brilliance of style, his characterization, his humor, and his narrative gift, but exposes his defects mercilessly. "Mr. Kipling is at his best when treating of Tommy Atkins in India, and of the natives. He shows meanly when writing cynical little tales of Anglo-Indian life, for though these are well enough for the columns of society journals, their view of life is contemptible, and their insight into the springs of human nature seldom rises above 'smartness'." Add to this the remark on Kipling's style in the essay on "Q",—that style which "aims too constantly at sharp effects, and always succeeds in getting them," which uses "the right word twice in three times."

The man who could make such observations on contemporaries has an uncommon gift for seeing objectively. This gift appears also in the sketches of his native village in his first important book, *Auld Licht Idylls*. The Thrums of these sketches is a good deal like Spoon River, Illinois, or Winesburgh, Ohio; rather more religious, no doubt, but also more primitive and rougher. Barrie is perfectly unflinching in his presentation of the coarseness and hard ugliness of the life of Thrums. We hear of "Daft Days, the black week of glum debauch that ushered in the year"; and of men and women herded together at night like animals in the bothies and barns at harvest. Characteristic incidents are the fight at Tammas Lunan's funeral, which was provoked by Dite Deuchars of Tilliedrum, who spat on the coffin; and the story of Pitlum's suicide. Pitlum hanged himself "between two hams from his kitchen rafters. The custom was to cart suicides to the quarry at the Galla pond and bury them near the cairn that had supported the gallows; but on this occasion not a farmer would

lend a cart, and for a week the corpse lay on the sanded floor as it had been cut down—an object of awe-struck interest to boys who knew no better than to peep through the darkened windows." Finally old Hobart and two others tied a rope around the body and dragged it from the farm to the cairn, a distance of four miles.

The wretched poverty of the weavers and the cruel burden of work under which they staggered are illustrated by the sketch of old Cree Queery, a figure of stark misery who might have come out of Hauptmann's *Weavers*, if the play had been written at that time (it appeared four years later than Barrie's book).

I remember Cree best as a battered old weaver, who bent forward as he walked, with his arms hanging limp as if ready to grasp the shafts of the barrow behind which it was his life to totter up hill and down hill, a rope of yarn suspended around his shaking neck and fastened to the shafts assisting him to bear the yoke and slowly strangling him. By and by there came a time when the barrow and the weaver seemed both palsy-stricken, and Cree, gasping for breath, would stop in the middle of a brae, unable to push his load over a stone. Then he laid himself down behind it to prevent the barrow's slipping back. On those occasions only the barefooted boys who jeered at the panting weaver could put new strength into his shriveled arms.

Barrie's realist critics will hasten to point out that *Auld Licht Idylls* is an early work written before the author had discovered the vein which was to make him famous. This is not the Thrums, they will add, of *A Window in Thrums* or *The Little Minister*. And of course it is quite true that in these later books Barrie has chosen to see the village, not as it might look to an impartial observer, but in the light of youthful recollection. He has done this deliberately. "This Thrums," he says, "is bleak and perhaps forbidding; but there is a moment of the day when a setting sun dyes it pink, and the people are like their town." Our realists would not see, or would not choose to represent, this moment; they would say, unjustly, that Barrie sees nothing else. Unjustly; for in these books Barrie gives us many glimpses of workaday routine and of hardship. He does not close his eyes to unpleasant realities, but he is chiefly interested in another kind of experi-

ence, not less real. "A great writer," he says, "has spoken sadly of the shock it would be to a mother to know her boy as he really is, but I think she often knows him better than he is known to cynical friends. We should be slow to think that the man at his worst is the real man." And elsewhere: "Love, it is said, is blind, but love is not blind. It is an extra eye, which shows us what is most worthy of regard. To see the best is to see most clearly, and it is the lover's privilege."

This, then, is Barrie's own defense. Sentiment and romance are realities in the heart of man. The realism which neglects them is incomplete and defective, and in so far false. Kindness, purity, and generosity are as real as cruelty, lust, and avarice; as real, and much more important. There is incredible goodness in human nature, as well as incredible baseness; and there is an inexhaustible reservoir of humor and fancy and gaiety which makes life infinitely interesting, even though its material conditions are harsh and ugly. I believe this is a sound defense of most of Barrie's later work. Not of all his work, as his worshipers would contend; for when M'Connachie takes complete control of him, he sometimes indulges in emotionalizing merely for the sake of emotion, at the cost of every sort of truth, or in perverse one-wing gyrations of fancy, interesting only as an aviator's freak stunts are interesting.

Barrie's sentimentalism is perhaps most conspicuous when he deals with one of his favorite themes, the relation between mother and son. *Margaret Ogilvy* has been highly and justly praised; it is an admirable portrait, only slightly idealized. It is clear that with all her virtues Margaret was exacting as a mother, and willingly received as her due the full measure of devotion from both daughter and son—especially from the daughter; also that to gain a point she did not hesitate to play on her son's love. When she fears that he may visit Stevenson at Vailima, she prevents him by speaking of the near prospect of her own death. The sentimentality of the book appears in the author's attitude. Barrie takes for granted Margaret's right to possess the lives of both her children, and glories in his own subjection to her. "Everything I could do

for her in this life I have done since I was a boy; I look back through the years, and I cannot see the smallest thing undone." Such perfection in filial duty as this is a little disquieting; one wonders, too, whether perfect filial loyalty is devotion to a mother at the expense of a father. Mention of the father is so slight and casual that we do not even learn his occupation. If only as Margaret Ogilvy's husband, he deserved more attention.

A similar view of a son's duty appears in *A Window in Thrums*. Jess demands Jamie's entire devotion, is desperately afraid he will marry, and is jealous at the least alarm. Barrie clearly sympathizes with her, and condemns Jamie for falling in love and not daring to communicate with his family thereafter. Poor Jamie has to be cruelly punished and to suffer agonies of remorse before his creator will think of forgiving him. Here Barrie's extravagantly sentimental view of a mother's claims has led him into a position which is ethically absurd. It is not Jamie, but the jealous and possessive old woman who thinks she owns him, body and soul, that is chiefly to blame for the tragedy. There is something a little morbid, something unpleasantly suggestive of the "Oedipus complex," in Barrie's attitude toward this relation.

Barrie's two weaknesses—his sentimentality and his proneness to rather ill-balanced aerial stunts of fancy—appear in *The Little White Bird*. This chaotic mixture of sentimental recollection, sketches of a small boy, a dog, and others, fairy stories for children and essay material, is artistically a failure. But it is of very great importance to the student of Barrie, because it deals with so many of his favorite themes. The point of view and the "frame" are supplied by a story called *The Inconsiderate Waiter*, published several years earlier. A sentimental clubman, who prides himself on his bear-like exterior, gets interested in a human situation which he has occasion to notice from his club window, and intervenes benevolently but as crustily as possible.¹

¹ Barrie fancies himself in this bear pose; he uses it in at least two other stories, *Gilray's Flower Pot* and *Houseboat Arcadia* in *My Lady Nicotine*.

The Little White Bird thus thrifitly utilizes an earlier story; and it contains material later developed into two plays and a long story for children. Here, in chapters XIV-XVIII, is the earliest version of *Peter Pan* and *Peter and Wendy*; here, in chapters XII and XVII, is the first sketch of *A Kiss for Cinderella*. The Peter Pan legend has been enormously popular with children and perhaps is already a "children's classic"; but to adult readers its fancies sometimes seem pretty tenuous. Other passages in the book recall "Ik Marvel" by their thin sentimentality. Thus "A Confirmed Spinster" explains how the narrator "became whimsical" by telling how he loved and lost. The description of the girl is lyrical and shows us M'Connachie in his most poetic mood; one feels that he is very grateful for his loss, since it gives so excellent an occasion for his eloquence.

The Little White Bird marks a turning point in Barrie's career. In it for the first time the sentimental-fanciful M'Connachie takes complete control. The realist asserts himself again many times, and contributes elements of strength to the plays; but from this time on the whimsical romancer has generally the upper hand.

Before writing *The Little White Bird*, however, Barrie had produced his two great novels, or rather his one great novel in two parts,—*Sentimental Tommy* and *Tommy and Grizel*. It is commonly said that *Tommy and Grizel*, like most sequels, is inferior to its predecessor; the fact is that the first part of the story is, if possible, finer and stronger than *Sentimental Tommy*. Nothing in the earlier book, not even the episode of Tommy's loss of the Blackadder prize because he couldn't think of the one and only right word, is finer than the story of Tommy's sprained ankle (a fiction which he deliberately converts into a fact), or his revelation as a hero at the tea-party, or the incident of Grizel's glove, or the effect upon Tommy of Elspeth's announcement that she is going to marry David. But Barrie found that he could not possibly end the book in a way satisfactory to his readers. The taste of the time demanded some sort of definite conclusion; so Barrie handed the story over to M'Connachie, who devised

some melodramatic episodes and an ironically tragic ending. This part of the book—all that follows Tommy's discovery that he doesn't want to marry Grizel—ought to be deleted; and the first part should be bound up with *Sentimental Tommy*.

These two books are central in Barrie's work. They are a brilliant and searching criticism of his temperament by his intelligence. M'Connachie appears in the story more as the hero than as the author; he is, of course, Tommy himself. As a study of the sentimental, the only book in English which can be compared with the story of Tommy is *The Egoist*; and Tommy is far more alive than Sir Willoughby Patterne, because he is drawn with more sympathy and more subtlety. He is more interesting, too, because he has imagination and creative power. Beside this sentimental dreamer of genius, with his infinite faculty for delighting and deluding himself and others, is Grizel, the most real and lovable of all Barrie's heroines; Grizel the utterly honest realist, with her clear vision and her passionate craving for truth in all things. She is Tommy's sternest critic; her he deceives only once, and then because her love conspires with him against her.

Since *The Little White Bird* Barrie has devoted himself almost entirely to the theatre. Nearly all his plays are romantic comedies, sometimes with an afterthought of laughter at their own extravagance. It is as stupid to judge them by purely realistic standards as it would be to condemn *Twelfth Night* for violating probability. If we are to understand and enjoy romantic comedy we must be willing to accept for the purposes of the entertainment whatever fanciful presuppositions the dramatist chooses to make. The scene may be an enchanted forest, as in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* or *Dear Brutus*; it may be a remote and magic-haunted island, as in *Mary Rose* or *The Tempest*. All that we have a right to expect is that, his hypothesis once granted, the playwright shall tell an interesting story, and that his principal characters shall be reasonably consistent. The more real and living the characters, the better the play. The story, of course, must justify the presuppositions; if it is trivial and silly, as in *Little Mary*, or if it is feebly planned, as in *A Kiss for Cinderella*, the play is a failure.

Barrie has had his failures; he has had his partial successes, like *Alice-Sit-by-the-Fire* and *Mary Rose*; he has also had his triumphant successes. As a costume comedy of graceful sentiment, *Quality Street*, I think, comes very near perfection. But the best of the longer plays are *The Admirable Crichton* and *What Every Woman Knows*. *Crichton* has a satisfying imaginative completeness, due in part to its excellence of plot, and in part to the fact that it represents a perfect blending of Barrie's realistic insight into character with his fancy and humor. M'Connachie devised the topsy-turvy central situation, and his cleverness everywhere enlivens the dialogue; but the realist in Barrie collaborated with him closely in the character drawing. And the implied criticism of the organization of English society cuts deep.

What Every Woman Knows is less romantic in circumstances and setting, though the capture of the student-house-breaker, John Shand, and the bargain made with him by Maggie's brothers furnish a delightfully novel opening for the story. The chief romantic trait, however, is the character of Maggie, who proves to be a conquering heroine of the true lineage of Rosalind and Portia. Like these noble ancestresses, and like her English cousins *Candida* and *Lady Cicely*, she is easily mistress of every situation, and competently manages the men for their good. The parallel with *Candida* is especially interesting. In each play the heroine has an ambitious, successful, and slightly pompous husband, who owes his success to his wonderful wife, and is at length by force of circumstances soundly humiliated and made to understand his wife's immense superiority and his own relative worthlessness. It is to be noticed that in presenting this theme Barrie is less romantic than Shaw. Shaw takes his heroine with entire seriousness; evidently he can see no flaw in her perfection. He makes it clear, for instance, that she is infinitely above such a human weakness as jealousy. Maggie, on the other hand, is sharply jealous, though too clever to let her husband see it; she humiliates her rival and even forces her to surrender the pendant which John has given her. The title of Barrie's play, moreover, (though this is a fact which *not* every woman

knows) is a shrewd ironic thrust at feminine vanity, which balances the ruthless exposure of masculine conceit. Like the title of *Much Ado About Nothing*, it is the realist's comment on the romanticist's charming story. After all, the man who thinks his success is entirely due to his own brilliance and the woman who thinks her husband's success is due mainly to her cleverness, are about equally likely to be mistaken.

The germ of *What Every Woman Knows* can be found, I think, in that remarkable seed-bed of Barrie's later work, *The Little White Bird*. Here Barrie observes in regard to the happily married young artist: "In that short year she had made him entirely dependent on her. It is ever thus with women; their first deliberate act is to make their husbands helpless. There are few men happily married who can knock in a nail." A similar observation had been made by another keen-eyed dramatist, August Strindberg, and by him developed into the theme of more than one play. The idea of dependence on a woman haunted Strindberg like a hateful dream, in which the woman took the form of a vampire, sucking the very life-blood of her husband's brain. This is the central idea of such "naturalistic" dramas as *The Father* and *Creditors*. To Barrie, a man's dependence on his wife is simply a normal fact of life; no sensible man who has a good wife wishes to be independent of her, any more than she of him. Which is the sentimentalist here,—the "naturalist", or the writer of romantic comedy? Which view of the facts is the more realistic?

In this connection another comparison seems worth suggesting. In *The Twelve-Pound Look*, an apparently light one-act piece, Barrie deals with the theme of Ibsen's *Doll's House*,—the woman who leaves a stupid and possessive husband to find her own personality. Barrie's Kate is, in some respects at least, a more convincing person than Nora. She does not change over night from a "lark" or a "squirrel" to a woman with a lawyer's power of cool analysis and effective presentation of a case. She is certainly more realistic than Nora in her way of solving her problem. Nora rushes off, banging the front door behind her, with no money and no

visible means of support. Kate does not take the plunge till she has secretly learned to use a typewriter and earned enough money to pay for her machine. There is no solemn arguing in Barrie's play, but I have a strong suspicion that there is more genuine human nature in it than in Ibsen's.

A distinctive trait of Barrie's one-act plays, which I find in no others to anything like the same degree, is their depth of perspective. Barrie frequently reminds us that we are at the theatre, and that his people are speaking and acting on a stage; yet all the while we are somehow persuaded that just behind the stage is the real world, from which these people have come to let us have a glimpse of them, and to which they will soon return. The characters do not seem invented for the purpose of the play; they have interests unconnected with the play, to which they refer; we see them from different points of view and in the round. Look, for instance, at that astonishing little piece, *The Will*. It gives us glimpses of a man and his wife visiting a lawyer's office on two occasions, and a third glimpse of the man coming alone. But in background, magically suggested, are two whole lives and the world in which they were lived. We look down similar deep vistas of human life in *Barbara's Wedding* and in *The New Word*. The same quality, of course, appears in the longer plays; but it is amazing that a dramatist should be able to convey the impression quite as successfully within the limits of a single act. This is perhaps the final evidence that a masterly realist has had a hand in the creation of the plays.

It is this combination of qualities, so baffling and enraging to the critic with a one-track mind, that makes Barrie unique and inimitable. His realistic vision is winged and plumed with fancy; what seem his most random shafts of fancy are often guided by that vision to the heart of some truth. When we sit down in a grown-up state of mind to read *Peter and Wendy* and try to estimate it, we may gravely conclude that it is insubstantial and too fine-spun; but when we see Peter on the stage or even in the movies, whether we are seven or seventy,

we yield to his spell, and

think there is no more behind
But such a day tomorrow as today,
And to be boy eternal.

For Peter is the most nearly perfect symbol yet created of the immortal spirit of childhood. And even in some of Barrie's less successful plays, such as *Alice-Sit-by-the-Fire* and *A Kiss for Cinderella*, where the situations vex us by their wilful extravagance, there is an inner light of truth which illuminates human character. In *Alice*, besides the impossibility of the opening situation and the climax, there is the incredible figure of Steve Rollo, on whom the whole plot depends. Yet Barrie has shown us in the mind of Alice a beautifully exact picture of how early middle life looks to itself and upon its children; and in the mind of Amy a perfect companion picture of how youth looks to itself and upon its elders. If a man can do this, he may construct his plot as crazily as he chooses, and hang it on a wooden peg like Steve Rollo, if he wants to. The critics may damn him; but the world will not forget him.

SIR JOHN RANDOLPH—ILLUSTRIOS UNCLE

EUDORA RAMSAY RICHARDSON

Richmond, Va.

HISTORY, with its notorious concentration upon favorites, has passed over many a man who deserves better treatment at its hands. Such a one is Sir John Randolph of Williamsburg, great uncle of Thomas Jefferson,¹ great uncle of John Randolph of Roanoke,² great-great uncle of John Marshall,³ and great-great-great uncle of Robert E. Lee.⁴

Sir John Randolph's unique contribution to history is four-fold: he collected the papers later used as sources for the first minute history of the oldest English colony in America; he was the first man in Virginia to report legal cases; he was influential in the passage of the colony's tobacco inspection law of 1730; and he played an important part in the controversy accompanying Walpole's unsuccessful but prophetic Tobacco Excise Bill. With a carelessness as amazing as it is unfair, historians have recorded Randolph's achievements with scarcely a mention of their author. The importance of his collection of papers goes unemphasized because from them later and better advertised copies were made. It was not until 1909 that his case reports were published. The tobacco inspection law, which ushered in unprecedented prosperity for the colony, is credited wholly to Governor Gooch; and the Excise Bill is known as Walpole's. So, somewhat in the interest of justice and somewhat to correlate the events of this epochal period in American history, I am attempting to lift a bit of the mist that has shrouded the significant career of Sir John Randolph of Williamsburg, whose life covered the years between 1693 and 1737.

¹ Jane Randolph, the daughter of Sir John's brother Isham, was the mother of Thomas Jefferson.

² Sir John's brother Isham married Jane Bolling, granddaughter of Pocahontas. John Randolph of Roanoke was their grandson.

³ Mary Isham Keith, granddaughter of Sir John's brother, Thomas, was the mother of John Marshall.

⁴ Elizabeth Randolph, sister of Sir John, married Richard Bland. Their daughter Mary married Henry Lee. The son of this union, Lighthorse Harry Lee, was the father of Robert E. Lee.

Two types of people are worthy to be called great—those who originate and those who carry on to effective completion. The floating hotels that cross the Atlantic in five days bear about as much resemblance to the "Clermont" as the amoeba does to Mary Garden. Yet without Fulton's little boat, there would be no "Oceanic," and from the amoeba was evolved the perfection of a Mary Garden. Astronomers today could startle Copernicus by their knowledge of the stars; physicists know more about the law of gravitation than Newton dreamed of; evolutionists have gone far beyond the Darwinian theory; psycho-analysts are deepening and expanding the investigations of Freud; psychologists are improving upon the tests set up by Binet. Yet the names of men whose inventions have given new meaning to civilization will continue to glow upon the pages of history undimmed by the work of those who have followed. Achievement can not rightly be measured except in relation to what has gone before. If Chaucer had not seen the possibilities of our tongue, there might have been no Shakespeare. Those who make their contributions to our civilization's complexities need not suffer by comparisons with each other. It is only fair, however, to remind ourselves that neither the size nor the quality of the contribution should be judged without due consideration of the times in which the contributor lived.

So, it seems to me, all things considered, John Randolph of Williamsburg was as significant a person as any of his distinguished nephews. While much of his work was left for others to finish, subsequent history can not take from him the credit of having been the initiator.

The first colonists were far too busy fighting starvation, primeval forests, unfriendly Indians, and establishing tobacco as their staple product to recognize the importance of recording their early struggles. So it happened that not only did John Smith as a colorful narrator of events have no worthy successor, but that such records as were made were treated with shameful lack of respect. The dawning of the eighteenth century, however, saw a slight relaxing of the strain that had characterized earlier days. The college of William and Mary,

established in 1693, gave new academic opportunities to the colonists. Coincidental with its founding, more planters than were formerly able to do so sent their sons abroad for additional study. John Randolph, having been graduated from William and Mary and having studied law at Gray's Inn and the Temple, was one of the first Virginians to receive the combined advantages of study at home and abroad. It is not strange, therefore, that his training and interests should have led him to contemplate a history of the colony and not strange that to such an end he began to collect and copy all available historical papers. Dying far too soon, however, he left only the documentary evidence of his labors. His nephew, William Stith,⁵ rector of Henrico Parish and one of the governors of William and Mary, took up the work his uncle had been unable to complete.

It is true, of course, that Robert Beverly, Sir John Randolph's brother-in-law, published in England in 1705 a history of Virginia's early days. The work is not comparable, however, in scope to that of Stith. "It is," says Jefferson, in his *Notes on Virginia*, "as concise and unsatisfactory as Stith is prolix and tedious." Prolifity, however, is a fault that delvers into the past find it in their hearts to pardon, while too great conciseness leaves them hungry to know more of the day that is gone. Historians since Jefferson's time have been grateful enough to Stith, but they have overlooked the fact that to Sir John Randolph is due a goodly share of their gratitude.

Yet Stith gives to his uncle full credit both for the idea prompting the history and for the material that made it possible. "As therefore my late uncle, Sir John Randolph," he writes in his preface, "had purposed to write a preface to our laws and therein to give an historical account of our constitution and government but was prevented from prosecuting it to effect, . . . I thought the history of Virginia would be no mean or unacceptable undertaking. . . . I had also by my intimacy with that gentleman had sight and perusal of many excellent materials in his hands. . . . Sir John's col-

⁵ Sir John's sister Mary married John Stith: William Stith was their son.

lection of publick papers and the capital records have been no little use to me."

Indeed, besides Smith's worthy history, Sir John's papers and the manuscript copy of the records of the London Company, which William Byrd bought in London and lent to the author, constitute the principal source material for William Stith's exhaustive account of the early days of Virginia. The manuscripts to which Stith minutely refers became the subject later of some discussion on the part of the few people who knew that Sir John bore to them some sort of relation.⁶ In the preface to the *Records of the Virginia Company* the statement is made by Miss Kingsbury, the editor, that the Miscellaneous Laws of 1623 and the Miscellaneous Records from 1606 to 1692, which became the property of the Library of Congress when Jefferson's entire collection of books was bought in 1815, are transcripts of the early eighteenth century attested by John Hickman, who was Clerk of the General Court in 1722. Add to this Stith's statement that Hickman made the copies for Sir John Randolph, and the original ownership of the material becomes reasonably established. In addition, it is conceded now that the Bland Manuscript, also a part of the Jefferson library, is Sir John Randolph's material, which in some way came into the possession of Richard Bland. Its counterpart, owned by the Virginia Historical Society and known as the Randolph Manuscript, is a copy which John Randolph of Roanoke caused to be made of the Bland Manuscript. So it would seem that to Sir John Randolph is due the credit for preserving many historical details which would otherwise have been lost.

Likewise Sir John was the first man to report the decided cases of the chief court of Colonial Virginia. His reports begin in 1729 and continue to his death seven years later. Edward Barradall, a younger attorney of Williamsburg, followed the older lawyer's example in the matter of reporting cases. Strangely, Barradall is frequently spoken of as the earliest Virginian reporter; yet many of Randolph's manuscripts antedate any of Barradall's. It is, therefore, not an

⁶*Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. XV, pp. 390-91.

unlikely deduction that Sir John's recognition that such records were important to subsequent legal proceedings served as Barradall's incentive. "Except a few cases reported by Jefferson and a very few by Hopkins," writes Major Robert Barton in his preface to *Virginia Colonial Decisions*, "these (the cases of Barradall and Randolph) are the only reported cases of the colonial period of one hundred and sixty-nine years." So, it may be concluded that had it not been for Sir John Randolph, in all likelihood we should have no authentic records of the proceedings of any Virginian courts.

The high-lights of Sir John Randolph's career came, however, in his relation to the colony's tobacco problem, in behalf of which he was twice sent to England. During all his life the situation had been rife with difficulties. Virginia had but one money crop. Tobacco was taxed when it was exported and taxed again when it reached England. For years planters had been complaining of the hardness of their lot. It was generally conceded that the quality of much of the tobacco exported was bad. Plans for improving the staple were ineffectual because Maryland and Virginia seemed unable to unify their endeavors. In 1720 we find an act passed by the House of Burgesses for preventing the tending of seconds, a law evidently easier to pass than to execute, because planters could evade it by exporting from Maryland and North Carolina. In 1727 George II was crowned in England, and William Gooch became governor of Virginia. Immediately the colony concentrated upon an effort to improve the tobacco situation. Conflicting, however, with plans for a better crop was a provision in one of the acts of Parliament which forbade the importation into England of all tobacco which had been stripped from the stalk. This the planters considered a hindrance to the improvement of tobacco, as well as an inconvenience. So in 1729 Sir John Randolph was sent to England to use every means to get the law abrogated.

Over the actual negotiations in London—the difficulties which confronted the agent of the colony, the tact and diplomacy involved in satisfactory adjustments and the means employed in interpreting the colony to the mother country—his-

tory has hung an impenetrable curtain. There is ample evidence, however, both that Virginia recognized the importance of sending a man who could find the common denominator for merchant, board of trade, revenue commissioner, and planter and that she was wholly satisfied with the outcome of the mission. It is a matter of history that the law was abrogated and that Sir John Randolph returned to Virginia in the highest favor. In the Journal of the House of Burgesses for May 26, 1730 is recorded a resolution to pay "one thousand pounds to John Randolph, Esquire for defraying his expenses to Great Britain and his late voyage thither and as recompence for his faithful and industrious service to his country."

Accordingly in 1730, with obstacles removed, the epoch-making tobacco inspection law was drawn. As presented to the House, it provided that all tobacco be placed in public warehouses, that inspectors be appointed by the governor, that shipping in bulk be prohibited, that tobacco failing to pass inspection be destroyed, that tobacco notes be issued in receipt for crops, and that penalties be exacted for violation of the law.⁷

The effective operation of the tobacco inspection law brought to the colony a prosperity such as Virginia had never enjoyed before. The simpler frame houses, such as Tuckahoe, were surpassed by mansions of which Westover and Mount Airy are typical; the planter whose brow had known the lines of care and the sweat of toil gave place to the country gentleman who took his exercise behind the hounds; and side by side with the horse that drew the plow were stabled blooded animals groomed for the races.⁸ Tobacco inspection, for which John Randolph paved the way, brought to Virginia that which he and its other advocates had predicted: it lifted the colony from pioneer conditions into economic stability.

It is a matter for inference that while on his first trip to England Randolph did more for the colony's tobacco than the mere elimination of stalks from the shipping. Undoubtedly he met Robert Walpole, then in the full bloom of his power and

⁷ Hening, *Statutes* IV, pp. 246-71.

⁸ "The Equine F. F. V.'s," in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, October, 1927.

well launched upon his program of duty-slashing. Rice and sugar had just been freed from import charges. There can be no question that Walpole, maintaining as he did toward the colonies an open mind and a liberal attitude, wanted to know more of the tobacco planter. Virginia could have found no better interpreter than John Randolph, a gentleman by birth and breeding, educated in London, familiar with English laws and manners—a man, according to Mr. Parks of *The Virginia Gazette*, "whose accomplishments received an additional grace and ornament from his person, which was of the finest turn imaginable."⁹ There was in the man an erudition and an urbanity that made him a match for the rough and ready Walpole. He knew not only Virginia's needs, but how to get those needs across to a statesman who would listen. About the whole episode is knit a web of conjecture but a conjecture strengthened by subsequent events of history. Undoubtedly this first mission to England opened the road toward another.

Two years later Randolph was sent back. The second trip, however, did not meet with results so immediately tangible as did the one that had to do with tobacco stalks and inspection. Yet its historic significance is considerable. Though some concrete evidence is available, along with a deal of evidence strongly circumstantial, details still remain in the realm of supposition.

In 1732 the House of Burgesses drew up a scheme for changing the customs on tobacco into the nature of an excise, which, when printed, was entitled *The Case of the Planters of Tobacco in Virginia*, and on June 29, 1732 resolved "that John Randolph, Esquire be appointed agent for the colony to negotiate the affairs of the colony in Great Britain, and that the sum of twenty-two hundred pounds be paid to him, out of the money in the hands of the treasurer, to defray his expenses and for a reward for his trouble and the taking of so long a journey."

Briefly extracted, the proposals made in *The Case of the Planters* involved storage not by merchants but in royal ware-

⁹ *Virginia Gazette*, March 11, 1737.

houses, a slight reduction in duties, an elimination of bonds securing duties upon importation of the staple, weighing of tobacco twice—first when it was landed and again when sold or reëxported—the retailer's payment of duty upon the last weight, reëxportation duty free, and the severest penalties for relanding tobacco after it had been delivered for exportation and penalties for illegal selling of the staple at home.

It is a great pity that the people who do things aren't the sort who keep diaries, or the sort to write self-revealing letters concerning their exploits. If Sir John hadn't been desperately busy accomplishing something in London, he might have been able to hand down to posterity an account of his visit, but then there might have been nothing worth handing down. So again little is known of his actual experiences in England. After the announcement in *The Gentlemen's Magazine* that John Randolph had come from Virginia for the purpose of getting tobacco excised, a devastating flood of controversy swept over England. Excise had already become a red flag to the conservative bull. Pamphleteers flourished like the wicked. Walpole was accused of favoring a blanket excise. In the midst of the seething waters Sir John Randolph kept his head well above the eddies. *A Vindication of the Case of the Planters* was published in England, unsigned but indisputably from the pen of Randolph, for addressed directly to Randolph a scathing, vitriolic, sophistical answer to the *Vindication* was published.¹⁰ Walpole showed his hand, with a bravery characteristic of the dauntless minister, and introduced in Parliament an excise bill that embodied the main points in *The Case of the Planters*. Finally, when the storm outside Parliament grew greater than Walpole had anticipated, he withdrew the bill, not because he had not the power to carry it, but because wisdom forbade so open a defiance of the people.

"It would be ridiculous," says John Morley in his *Life of Walpole*, "in the light of modern experience to waste a single line in vindicating the great policy to which Walpole's tobacco

¹⁰ Letter to Sir John Randolph from the Merchants and Factors of London, printed for R. Charlton at the corner of Sweetings Alley next the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, 1733. Typewritten copy, Virginia State Library.

bill was the opening."¹¹ From the Right Honorable J. M. Robertson in his *Bolingbroke and Walpole* comes the statement that no sounder scheme was ever framed than the excise bill of 1733.¹² Green declares the bill to be the first measure in which an English minister showed any real grasp of taxation. "The scheme," he adds, "was an anticipation of the principles which have guided English finance since the triumph of free trade."¹³ But Walpole was ahead of his time. Lord John Russell in 1846 could effectively carry free trade into British commerce, but in 1733 Walpole's was a voice crying in the wilderness of tangled traditions. The organized smugglers of England, Robertson believes, held up the hands of the patriots in Parliament and befogged the issue by a campaign in the name of liberty.

It may never be possible accurately to determine just how great a part Randolph played in the fight for the excise bill. Alderman Perry, who led the opposition on the floor of Parliament, scouted the sufferings of the Virginians as set forth in *The Case of the Planters* and asserted that none of them had ever complained until instigated from England. The merchants in their open letter to Randolph accused the colony's agent of being "more influenced by someone in London than by those who sent him over and paid him 2200 pounds." Undoubtedly at the time Randolph was recognized to be Virginia's connecting link with England. Since nothing was heard in the colony of the plan embodied in *The Case of the Planters* until John Randolph's return from his first trip to England, it seems well within the realm of probability that it was he who suggested the whole scheme to the House of Burgesses. In addition, it is more than probable that Sir John Randolph actually wrote the pamphlet he carried to England. Coming as it does from the House of Burgesses, *The Case of the Planters* does not bear the name of an individual author. The style, however, is similar to that of Randolph's *Vindication*. Furthermore, it is not unlikely that the excise scheme—identical in its main provisions with *The Case of the Planters*—instead

¹¹ *Life of Walpole*, p. 170.

¹² Roberson, J. M., *Walpole and Bolingbroke*.

¹³ Green, *Short History of England*, p. 731.

of having originated with Walpole and having been passed over to Randolph to carry back to Virginia (a theory held by no less authority than Sioussat)¹⁴ sprang from the brain of Randolph and that to its program Walpole was converted. At any rate, Sir John Randolph's name is indelibly written along with Walpole's in the beginnings of the great movement that established England's supremacy in trade—and Americans have somehow forgotten to turn back the pages and look with pride upon the legend.

Concerning the life of this man who crowded much into a short span of years facts are all too meager. Whatever injustice he may subsequently have suffered, however, he was not without honor in his own time and country. Though he died at the age of forty-four, he held the positions of clerk of the Council, treasurer of the colony, president of the county court of Gloucester, lieutenant-colonel for the militia of Gloucester, member of the House of Burgesses, speaker of the House, and recorder for the newly organized borough of Norfolk. According to Dr. Lyon G. Tyler, Sir John Randolph was the only native Virginian ever to be knighted. It was on the second trip to England that John Randolph annexed the *sir*. When he was commissioned to carry *The Case of the Planters* on its long journey, the entry in the Journal of the House of Burgesses shows him to be simply John Randolph, Esquire. When he returns, he is respectfully mentioned as Sir John Randolph.

A few of his speeches, reported in the Journal of the House of Burgesses, the pamphlet written in England, his case reports, and two letters to Ex-governor Spotswood, appearing in *The Virginia Gazette*—the principal extant products of his pen—are singularly revealing of the man. His writing shows a combination of facility and terseness—accompaniments of a well-ordered mind.

Without the evidence of his controversy with the merchants in England and with Spotswood, the man would appear too popular for the critic to be sure that he possessed the

¹⁴ "Virginia and the English Commercial System," *American Historical Association Report*, 1905, pp. 94-95.

stamina of true greatness. His elections to offices seem to be always without opposition. Governors (even Spotswood in the early days), burgesses, and ordinary citizens united to do him honor. When Gooch recommended him to fill Holloway's place as speaker of the House, he was unanimously elected. On his first trip to England William and Mary College trusted him with an important mission. The president and masters of the college requested Sir John to show to the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of the Customs the inadequacy of the export tax on tobacco for the college's maintenance, because of the fraudulent shipping from North Carolina and Pennsylvania where the tax was not collected. He was to suggest that the Lords and Commissioners take out the revenue themselves and allow a yearly consideration for it from the quit rents of Virginia. Sir John was also entrusted with the purchase of books for the Indian House, Brafferton. With his usual efficiency he seems to have performed his duties to the satisfaction of those who commissioned him.¹⁵

But Sir John Randolph did have a healthy dispute with the man who was governor of the colony from 1710 to 1722 and was then living in Virginia as a private citizen. The controversy between Randolph and Spotswood is published in *The Virginia Gazette*. Sir John's letters take the form of logical statements of fact, flavored by neither malice nor spleen. Spotswood's reply is tinged with personalities and the bitternesses of a man disappointed and defeated.

Surely a man who could argue valiantly with an ex-governor at home and merchants abroad possessed the courage of his convictions. His was not the popularity of a molly-coddle. A glimpse of the high esteem in which his fellow colonists held him can be gotten from the account in the *Virginia Gazette* of the ovation in the borough of Norfolk just after his appointment to the post of recorder. "Sir John Randolph being appointed recorder of the said borough made a visit to them. . . . The gentlemen of the said town and neighborhood shewed him all imaginable respect, by displaying the colors and firing the guns of the vessels lying there,

¹⁵ *William and Mary Quarterly*, I, p. 185.

and entertaining him at their houses in the most elegant manner for several days on this joyful occasion."¹⁶ One is inclined to think that he is making no idle boast when he answers Spotswood's complaint that Randolph has turned against the man who first elevated him by saying that not by the governor but by his own learning and behavior had he been advanced. Revealing of his independence in religion is the preamble to his will, published in 1741 in *The General Magazine*, founded by Benjamin Franklin, in which he deems it necessary to make a sort of confession of faith, more, it would seem, to square himself with God than with man. "Blind zealots" he accuses of having called him certain unpleasant names, such as deist, heretic, and schismatic—terms that still fall glibly from the uncompromising lips of fundamentalists.

But when Sir John Randolph died, he was eulogized soundly by his friend Mr. Parks, editor of *The Virginia Gazette*. Because he lived in that Utopian day before historians must also be psycho-analysts and because two centuries of silence are proving the despair of a biographer who is not inhibited from employing the methods of Rupert Hughes, Sir John must stand as an exemplar of all the manly virtues—"a gentleman of one of the best families in this country . . . with parts bright and strong . . . his learning extensive and useful . . . a tender and indulgent parent . . . attentive to the interests of the public, . . . with something very great and noble in his presence and deportment, which at first sight bespoke and highly became that dignity and eminence which his merit had obtained him in this country."

¹⁶ *The Virginia Gazette*, Nov. 19, 1736.

DANTE FOR TODAY

HENRY BELLAMANN

New York City

THE EFFORT to obtain a perspective of existence—to view the significant relation of the parts of life to the whole—must seem a problem of great complexity to any thinker in any age. Time often furnishes the solution, when the years have swept away the puzzling debris of irrelevant detail. Naturally this comes too late to be of service to the past, and most often does not present clear aspects of value to the present when new and strange confusions abound.

Owing to the enormous expansion of the segments of civilization, contemporary existence makes seemingly irreconcilable claims on human adjustability, and exhibits contradictions and difficulties as bewildering to church and state as they are to the individual. We live in a split universe. The claims of church and state, of religion and ethics, of morality and freedom, of utility and beauty, seem in hopeless conflict. Ideas of international welfare are lost in the immediate urgency of nationalism. The structure of religious beliefs cannot sustain the universal emphasis of materialism. Morality disintegrates in the modern concept of individualism. The extension of the known universe by the investigations of science has disconcerted ancient human egotisms. Hopes of celestial rewards have disappeared with the threats of fiery punishments. The consequent liberation, instead of widening spiritual horizons, has resulted in a *laissez faire* which lays the fabric of human responsibility in fragments.

Across this world of unstrung thought and feeling, blown into illogical patterns by every casual wind of doctrine, there sounds one voice discoursing gravely and beautifully of eternal values. It is the voice of Dante Alighieri, certain after six centuries, in the essential truths of man's dignity and responsibility, of the greatness of human destiny and the possibility of righteousness, of the final beneficence of existence, and of the perfectibility of the individual through the royal investment of free will. The utterance of this man carefully

sustained on the great themes of destiny, is set to a verbal music of such poignancy and power, of such magical beauty, that its impact is far stronger and more immediate than the impact of the soberer words of theologians and philosophers.

Men in the fury and intensity of contemporary life, which too often seems "a cage of steam-shot agony", are less inclined than ever to listen respectfully to the sage voices of religion and philosophy. We constantly hear it said that such counsel is admirable theory, but that it is not "practical," and that following such precept "will not get you anywhere". In the phrase "getting somewhere" is crystallized all of the modern urgency of material realization.

It is precisely here that Dante appears as a spokesman of eternal things with peculiar power and effect. Dante *was* a practical man. This zealous Florentine with all of his fervor for politics and morals, with all of his eloquence about justice and love, was a man vitally concerned with the affairs of his town, his church, his state, and his own soul as well. For with singular clarity he saw the "practical" affairs of every day and the spiritual affairs of eternity as one. There was for him no divisibility between the earthly life and the life eternal. They were made of the same stuff, and the weaving was daily in his own hands.

Captiousness will always listen to the man who has, in the modern phrase, "been there". In every minor matter of the daily engineering of contemporary affairs there is sought the authority of experience. Dante lived in a century that offered to the individual the richest and fullest opportunity for living. A wayfarer, like ourselves, through the dark and savage way of life's mystery, he paused even at life's high tide to give us the fruit of that rounded experience which, in the terms of glowing poetry, he raised to universal significance. The road Dante traveled was the long road of education and discipline which must be traversed by every human being. The struggle was for the possession of his own spirit against the odds which, in differing guise, confront every one of us. Dante was as modern as tomorrow in this mood of full acceptance. No individualist demands a completer self-realization; but Dante's

concept of self-realization was through the perfection of knowledge and self control. What he perfectly knew was that character is the one enduring human achievement, and that through character alone does man achieve dominion of himself, the world, and eternity.

Visioning man as divine through his unique power of making or unmaking himself, he utilized the full glory of his eloquence in stressing the dignity of this high destiny. Dante's own stature as a man matched the greatness of this vision, so that he spoke always from the fulness of disciplined experience. His pride, his restlessness, his hatreds—his lusts, even, find a human echo in all of us, but he was of stern character-stuff that refused steadfastly to view sin, in the fashionable fiction manner of the present, as something picturesque, or conceivably decorative, or in any sense necessary for complete living. He knew it in its true form, as vulgar, degrading, bestial, with its ultimate consequence dehumanizing, paralyzing, defacing, nullifying everything that might justify man in thinking of himself in the image of God.

Step by step in the *Inferno*, Dante takes us through complete ranges of human defection. Every conceivable deviation of mind and heart from the right is minutely considered. No one knew better than he how the green bay tree may flourish, but he matched modern psychology in delving to the depths of the sinner's soul, revealing the twisted ugliness within.

All of the shadowy sadness of Limbo, the soul-shaking terrors of infernal winds, the hateful persecutions by demons and monsters, the cruelties of fire and ice, the disgusts of mud and vile rains, the horror and lewdness of mid-Hell punishments, the grotesquerie of deformity and transformation, the hideous tortures of the lower reaches, the ghastly increase of malformation—these were never the imaginings of an embittered man seeking literary vengeance on his contemporaries. They are the logical conclusions of sin, the inner Hell of the sinning soul made manifest in pictures of awful power—matching ugliness with ugliness, spite with spite, until evil stands completely unmasked.

But Dante's Hell is not merely a document of hate and loathing. His journey through the dark demesne of the damned is marked with pity and tears, as was Christ's contemplation of a recreant world. His gentle regret in the unlit monotony of Limbo, his tears for Paola and Francesca, his sense of common guilt with those whom pride had led to fall, fill the pages of the *Inferno* with music of mournful tenderness. The curious detail of all that hopelessness contains no hint of morbid sadism: he makes his report that the world may derive from it a formula of strength. To that end, and that end only, does he build the mighty edifice of darkness and fill it with hurricanes of horror in the great aesthetic of truth.

Never before, nor since, has such a panorama of the black frontiers of pain and evil been unrolled for us. But the potentiality of the human heart for evil is matched by its illimitable possibility for good. If Dante had given us only the *Inferno* we might well despair, but his searching plumbed not only the fearful depths of Caina, but arose as well to infinities of light in the wheeling circles of perfected harmony.

Justice and love are the words most often on his lips. He rarely mentions them separately. Seemingly he cannot think of them apart. One derives from the other—each is the other, springing as twin streams from the same source. If the grim stones of Hell's prison are laid in justice, there flows over them always the commiserating tenderness of the word love.

Amore, amore, amore,—sounding from infinite distance through the sunless grottoes like an eternal bell.

Amore, amore, amore,—nearer and clearer, more joyous and hopeful in the *Purgatorio*. The reader is never beyond its sound.

Amore, amore, amore,—the *Paradiso* is thronged, alive, with its multitudinous chime.

The reader who goes to Dante for an interpretation of life, for light, or consolation, is likely on first contact to be disconcerted and repelled by the *Inferno*. The modern concept of the universe and all life in it, as a continued process of changeless change, is affronted by the static horror of this fiendish

place. Taken with a concession to literalness the whole idea seems a libel on the very names of Goodness and Love which Dante invokes throughout the *Divine Comedy*. It is difficult to forget the tolling of those words inscribed on the gates of Hell—

“Lasciate ogni speranza voi ch’entrate.”

Perhaps the best we can make of that is to say that those who persist in the descent—who choose the way of sin—must be warned that no hope lies there—no way out.

We must approach the *Inferno* as a picture of the soul still lost in the ways of sin. Here is the deformity of wrong, and the pain that conscience has power to inflict.

Love is the word most diffidently used by people of today. We should surrender to its repetition in the *Divine Comedy* with faith in its power to transform the import of those somber letters above the portal. When we read in the fourth canto of the *Inferno* that once Hell shook to its foundation at the expiring cry of Christ, dying for love of the world, that the very structure of the infernal regions was shattered and its ancient edicts denied by the “great delivery”, perhaps the imagination, winged with knowledge of the illimitable power of love, may be able to picture a far off day when the torture chambers of Hell shall be empty, and the great winds shall no more bear the “starling flights” of drifting souls.

It is best to read the *Inferno* as a vivid and picturesque account by Dante the man, of his discovery of himself in the ways of error—Dante, a man like ourselves, endowed with the usual human weaknesses, passions, and prides. With rare powers of delineation and inexorable honesty, he looks evil in the face, sees it as it is, and returns to us unforgettably exact pictures of its protean loathsomeness.

We may change the name of Dante’s God, we may dislocate his Hell, disperse his Heaven, and reduce his *Purgatorio* to a mental process, but we cannot change the significance, the discipline, the power for regeneration, the eternal hope which these concepts must ever have for the lonely human soul, which “groping by its own frail light” in the “selva oscura” of the world, seeks a way to spiritual empire.

The nomenclature of man's spiritual philosophy may change with changing concepts of life and of God, but the principles inherent in the lesson of Dante's journey through the Hell of sin-experience, the Purgatory of penitence and expiation to the Paradise of salvation—these are eternal, if we are ever in any sense to know that harmony with law which is the love "moving the sun and other stars".

It is this that we must seek in the *Divine Comedy* in which a poet of incomparable endowment essays the loftiest theme in literature. After the appalling terrors of the *Inferno* we come upon the mount of Purgatory with the relief that the hopeless must feel at hope's renewal. After night "pierced by no star" we rebehold the myriad marchers of the sky, with their peculiar confirming sense of eternity, and from their reassuring gleam, marking the emergence from the underworld, there is a steady increase of radiance through the *Purgatorio* to the *Paradiso* where light "multiplies into light" until the insupportable effulgence of the final vision of God passes the poet's powers of description. The vivid details of the *Inferno* convey such a sense of reality that many readers have difficulty in reshaping it to allegorical application. This part of the *Divine Comedy* might well be read swiftly at first for the 'story', and for a general survey of the remarkable structure. Much of the magnificent poetry strikes with full force in such a reading. Afterward it may be read and reread more quietly for deeper meaning and more personal applications.

The *Purgatorio* offers less of such difficulty. The milder torments are more in the nature of our daily struggles and conflicts. The setting aids. Here are the familiar landscapes of the world, the reassurances of recurrent night and day, the known sun and moon and stars, the living shimmer of the sea, and the intimate beauties of flowers and grasses moving in the wind. The action takes place along the accustomed ways of life of the everyday world, attended by the normal phenomena of existence. It is against this relatively comfortable background that the great purgatorial drama is enacted. A benevolent design of righteous law provides the *mis-en-scene* for a

struggle whose intensity emphasizes the central theme of Dante's work—the enormous importance and incalculable worth of the soul.

If the *Purgatorio* is read in this light, each detail of the elaborate mechanism falls neatly into its significant place. The sins being expiated on the several ledges of the mountain are in us all as dispositions. The seven P's on Dante's forehead are on the brow of every man. Modern psychology and the findings of psychoanalysis are in amazing accord with the teachings of the *Purgatorio*. As the physical location of the Mount of Purgation is literally on the other side of the world from the *Inferno*, so is it in every figurative sense the opposite. In Hell we sense constantly the leaden downward drag of sin—down, and infinitely down. On Purgatory we feel the constant urge and release upward. Here are the expansive intimations of illimitable possibilities in the soul whose growth is begun in the direction of spiritual recreation. It is not an accident of the narrative that at the nethermost point of Hell the travelers by a supreme effort of the will were able to reverse themselves and start upward. Dante felt that he must fall back into Hell, but Virgil, the voice of reason says:

Keep fast thy hold, for by such stairs as these
Must we perforce depart from so much evil.

The *Paradiso* has always been for most readers the most abstruse part of the Divine Comedy. We are forced to think in terms of an obsolete cosmogony and an ancient theology. Once we have passed the initial difficulty of accepting this apparatus as an artistic convention, we are able to see the immense power and simplicity of Dante's method in depicting concepts which ordinarily lie beyond the reach of thought. By the mere increase of light and motion, the latter symbolizing life, the celestial traveler attains a constantly clearing and widening vision of truth. Of that strong winged ascent from heaven to heaven, from circle to circle of dazzling purity, echoed through and through by myriad chants, one cannot write. The reach of the poet's fantasy borne up by his unshakable faith, lifts the reader to a plane of mystical communion

with the Infinite. This is the supreme achievement of the *Divine Comedy*, as it is the unique and unsurpassed feat of existing poetry. To leave the world with its encumbering multitude of close pressing problems, its dejecting personal miseries, so far behind that we can smile down at the insignificant planet which is the arena of our conflicts, is to obtain a just perspective of life and its relation to greater things and so render most of our inescapable vexations incapable of harm by sheer minimization.

Contemplation is almost a lost virtue in contemporary Occidental civilization. Dante has the power to carry us so far from the world in contemplation that we are beyond the reach of the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune", but this mystical detachment is not one of the immediate returns of Dante study. The pages are thickly studded with more commonplace benisons. He knew, he tells us, how bitter is the bread of exile, how steep the strangers' stairs. Even in the blinding illumination of remote heavens we feel the warm human pulse of the man who was never a closet philosopher weaving abstractions, but one like ourselves learning the difficult lessons of life through each day's trials, and delving deep for the hidden sweet in each untoward event. Surely there is not anywhere a steadier voice to quiet this hysterical age.

So far we have not spoken of the peculiar power of the *Divine Comedy* that is inherent in the nature of the poetry itself. As we read, the great singing structure of the poem seems ultimately to come to life and to proclaim the inherent rightness of the many intricate parts. There is in this something of the immediacy of pure music whose truth transcends mere logic. To this end it is urged that the reader unfamiliar with Italian should become intimately acquainted with the poem through many readings of various translations, and then to utilize some one of the editions with the original text paralleled on opposite pages. One very quickly senses the marvelous and individual music of Dante's Italian in which so many subtle overtones of meaning reside.

The texture of the poem is curiously symphonic. The sense is so often inherent in the adroitly wedded sound that it

obtains an amazing reinforcement. Such felicities are innumerable, and once fixed in the ear the mind goes beauty haunted ever afterward. This great heritage of sheer loveliness is one of the most important values of the Divine Comedy. It is better to know one such supreme book well than to be acquainted with a dozen lesser literatures, and so to walk hand in hand, almost one wishes to say heart in heart, with an heroic soul who never sought escape from the world but who toiled and wept and suffered to write this dream of world rectification, seeing justification of life in terms of living, happiness in acceptance, and peace in faith.

The three divisions of the Divine Comedy close on the word *stars*, as the movements of a symphony come to rest in the peace of the tonic chord. The word rings out each time like an invocation of those shining emblems of eternity to witness the triumphant beatitude of a soul's self-possession. This is the greater Dante who was able to know the essential heart of humanity from the life of his own century and to perceive that certain needs would continue to haunt mankind with a sense of incompleteness so long as any kind of civilization persists. Here is the thought and vision of a man who, even while speaking to his own people in his own time, could rise above the centuries with a universality of comprehension and interpretation that makes him a teacher, a moralist, and a religionist of unmatched corrective power. The profundity and sweep of his message is only the greater that it is expressed through the medium of a perfected art—an art informed with integrity, loftiness of purpose, purity of thought and tenderness of feeling—the whole fused in the divine fire of genius.

THE DAILY AND WEEKLY PRESS OF ENGLAND IN 1861

HENRY D. JORDAN

Dartmouth College

IN 1860 a "free press" had existed in England for some time; the taxes on knowledge were about to disappear entirely; and journalism was already in large part what it has remained since, a business conducted for profit. After the tax on advertisements was remitted in 1853 and the stamp duty dropped in 1855, the number of weeklies and dailies in England increased rapidly. In 1855 there were about seven hundred newspapers in the United Kingdom; in 1860, over eleven hundred, and we are told that newspapers made their first appearance in as many as a hundred and twenty-three English towns in that period. There were no daily journals in England outside of London in 1855, but, beginning in that year, enterprising provincial proprietors converted¹ their papers into dailies in order to compete with the new penny journals in the metropolis. By 1861 each of the more important towns had one or more daily papers.¹

This remarkable expansion was due to the fact that untouched fields were now opened for exploitation. The larger market arose from an increasing demand and, what was more important, from a general lessening in the cost of production. No great event, such as the Education Act of 1870, augmented the number of potential readers, nor was it a time of political excitement at home, but a series of stirring occurrences outside of the country helped to enhance the demand for news. The Crimean War, the Indian Mutiny, the liberation of Italy, the American Civil War, the Polish Revolt of 1863, and the question of Schleswig-Holstein formed an almost continuous chain of incidents, interesting and even exciting to large numbers in Victorian England.

The end of the advertisement tax was essential to the alliance between trade and journalism which is the funda-

¹ *Newspaper Press Census for 1861* (Arthur Hall & Co., London, 1861). Charles Knight, *Passages of a Working Life*, III, p. 146 ff., says that in 1855 145 towns with a population of 5000 each had no newspaper.

mental economic condition of the modern newspaper. The elimination in 1855 of the penny stamp on all periodicals containing news helped to bring their price within the means of classes other than the well-to-do. The abolition of the tax on paper in 1861 reduced the expenses of large consumers of that commodity. At the same time, means came to hand for gathering and spreading news. Before 1860 only a small part of the news, even in the better papers, came by electric telegraph. But the use of this invention was extended with the laying of submarine cables to Ireland, the Continent, and in the Mediterranean, and it became particularly important in reporting foreign affairs. Telegraphic connection between New York and Halifax *via* Portland shortened the time for the transmission of news from the United States. Within England itself, it was necessary to use the telegraph if papers outside of London were to exist, in view of the growth of railroads.

The excessive cost of communication by wire was in part overcome by the organization of a bureau for collecting news and distributing it to the provincial journals, thus enabling them to compete with a measure of equality instead of copying from the powerful London papers of the previous day.² Methods of printing were at the same time undergoing improvement, making it possible to print larger editions for quick sale. The first Hoe press was brought to London from New York in 1855 by the proprietor of a weekly which circulated among working men, but it was later adopted by the *Times*. The invention of the *papier mâché* stereo-plate method was a significant advance toward the development of cylindrical presses.³ Once they came into use, the old five-penny journal faced rivals which were sold for two or three pence and before long for a penny, and popular journalism, as far as it existed before the Harmsworths, had arrived.

The partly printed sheet was used shortly before 1860; in that year at least two firms were providing sheets or stereo-graphic plates to smaller country journals. These "patent

² Knight, *Passages of a Working Life*, III, p. 156 ff.

³ Thomas Catling, *My Life's Pilgrimage*, p. 50 ff.; on the introduction of "type revolving machines" to European newspapers, see Robert Hoe, *A Short History of the Printing Press*, p. 32 ff.

“insides” contain very little internal evidence as to provenance, though one of them, judging from the advertisements, was in close connection with the always inventive firm of Cassell. The enterprise which became the Central Press in 1863 started with the successful attempt of two brothers-in-law in 1860 to conduct from London a daily newspaper in Plymouth. At first they merely sent down a large part of the paper in type; their success inspired extension, and they established a similar journal at Hull. Finally, the Central Press was organized, consisting of a staff of writers in London who produced from day to day summaries of English and foreign news, “London Letters,” parliamentary reports, trade reports, and even leading articles, which were sent in stereotype columns to country editors, who selected from the package.⁴

The story of the beginnings of Reuter’s, the most important British news agency, is told in all histories of journalism, but they do not describe exactly its organization and connections. Reuter established himself as an essential part of the British press about 1858 and thenceforth did little more than maintain and enlarge the business. He supplied all the foreign telegraphic news of the British press until 1865, at least; only after that date did editors and correspondents muster courage to use the wire for descriptive letters. Exciting events in foreign countries stimulated the growth of this enterprise. Two great feats of Reuter still cited are the first bringing to London Napoleon’s III’s famous New Year remark to the Austrian Ambassador and the news of Lincoln’s assassination. To secure priority for his American reports, Reuter had off the coast of Ireland an elaborate system involving water-tight packages thrown to a fast launch from mail steamers and a

⁴On the origin of the modern news-collecting organization, Lucy M. Salmon, *The Newspaper and the Historian*, p. 116 ff., found nothing but the idea existing before 1863. A writer in the *Quarterly Reviewer*, CL, p. 531, attributes the origin of the notion to “Mr. William Eglinton of Bartholomew Close,” but gives no date. See also, *Western Morning News of Plymouth*, files; T. H. S. Escott, *Masters of English Journalism*, p. 300; H. R. Fox Bourne, *English Newspapers*, H. p. 258 ff.; W. Hunt, *Then and Now*, ch. vii; W. R. Nicoll, *James Macdonell, Journalist*, p. 109.

special wire from Crookhaven to Cork. There is no evidence that Reuter's enjoyed any concealed relation with the government or with any propagandist organization.⁵

Although the *Times* had already passed the zenith of its power, it was still first and foremost among the news gatherers of the time. Its circulation in 1854 was more than twice that of the other metropolitan dailies combined, but ten years later, although it had reduced its price, it had been surpassed by one of its penny rivals.⁶ The amazing preëminence of the "leading journal" did not necessarily decline with its relative circulation; the pinnacle on which the *Times* stood during the Crimean War was very slowly eroded in the 'sixties and 'seventies. Its position of predominant influence was due largely to superiority in journalistic technique, taken in the widest sense. In part the acquired prestige of the *Times* was maintained through momentum; in part, through its access to the best political information in an age when politics was largely the affair of a homogeneous social group; in part, through its independence of view closely attuned to popular feeling; in large part, through real enterprise in its methods of gathering and presenting news. It paid its contributors in both news and editorial departments at a higher rate than did its contemporaries; it knew the advantage of a sensational "scoop"; it rivaled government agencies in securing prompt news from India and, as a superlative help in maintaining its primacy, it selected and sent out the first and perhaps the greatest of war correspondents. William Howard Russell, one of the few persons who acquired much glory from the Crimean War, added equally to his own fame and to the power of the *Times*. The effect of his letters and the supporting editorial comment on the conduct of the campaign and the organization of the War Office was tremendous. In subsequent wars the British

⁵ James Grant, *The Newspaper Press*, II, p. 324 ff.; J. D. Symon, *The Press and its Story*, p. 87 ff.; the *Times*, Feb. 27, 1899; *Annual Register*, 1889, Pt. II, 136; *Men of the Time*, editions of 1862, 1872, 1887, s. v. Reuter; the *Nation* (London), XVII, 108.

⁶ The *Times* reduced its price to 4d in 1855, when the stamp act was repealed, and to 3d in 1861, when the paper duty was repealed; this remained its price until 1914.

public was ready to give attention to effective writers at the scene of conflict.⁷

It is difficult to analyze precisely the place of the *Times* in English life; it must suffice to say that in 1860 it was the British newspaper in a sense that has never since been true of it or any other journal. Not a party, but a "national" organ, it was intimately concerned with every political issue. On the lesser questions the voice of the "Thunderer" was often decisive; in larger matters, with small care for consistency, it was pretty sure to be found on the side of the largest battalions for the moment.⁸ During the six years of the Palmerstonian era, the *Times* was more or less frankly in alliance with the minister in his extremely conservative liberalism, an alliance which reflected the mind of upper middle-class and aristocratic England. In fact, the *Times* voiced in perfection that complacent Philistinism which Matthew Arnold so earnestly combated.⁹

Such a journal naturally had many enemies and critics. Every individual, sect, or society with a crotchet which sought and failed to obtain the support of the paper was likely to indulge in recriminations against it. Every movement which obtained recognition after small beginnings remembered the day when the *Times* spurned it.¹⁰ Every small journal with an eye to its own *kudos* sought to lay bare the inconsistencies of its great rival, while quoting freely from its columns. The *Times* could be the more easily blamed in that it was remote and dignified.¹¹

⁷ Sir Edward Cook, *Delane of the Times*; J. B. Atkins, *Life of W. H. Russell*, I, p. 311 ff. *In re* the heavy expense which the Indian mutiny caused the paper, a member of the staff wrote in 1858: "It was, however, one of those occasions on which it would never have done for us to have been content with moving neck and neck with the penny papers."

⁸ Cf. the passage in the *Saturday Review* quoted by Salmon, *The Newspaper as an Authority*, p. 384. Lincoln's remark (Atkins, *Life of Russell*, II, 14) is familiar: "The London *Times* is one of the greatest powers in the world; in fact, I don't know anything which has more power, except perhaps the Mississippi." The *Times*, said Emerson (*English Traits*, ch. xv) "wishes never to be in a minority."

⁹ Matthew Arnold, *Friendship's Garland* (London, 1871), p. 37.

¹⁰ A famous case was the Anti-Corn Law League, which the *Times* suddenly discovered in 1845 as a "great fact" after ignoring it for several years. The Union side in the American Civil War is a more complex example of the same thing.

¹¹ See the *North British Review*, XXXIV, p. 199 ff., for some shrewd remarks on the *Times*. Since 1864 the *Times* has published from its printing records its

Of course the *Times* never formed, guided, or reflected the opinions of all Englishmen or even of a majority of those who had political weight. But its news service was so full that other papers were merely supplementary to it; one consulted other journals only for information interesting for geographical, economic, partisan, literary, or religious reasons.

The *Morning Advertiser*, the "Tiser" familiar to readers of novels, was not, properly speaking, a political newspaper, though it purveyed news and was the first to accept the professed service of Reuter's bureau. "Neither Whig, Tory, nor Radical", it was for many decades the recognized organ of the licensed victuallers; that is, of the brewers and distillers. That it ranked with the *Times* in circulation and influence is a statement quite inadmissible.¹² The *Morning Chronicle* was in 1861 already moribund, approaching the ignominious end of a glorious career. The *Sun* apparently had neither enterprise or influence; it was to expire within ten years. The chief Liberal organ of dignity in any way comparable to the *Times* was the *Daily News*, famous for having had Dickens as its first editor. Though it had fewer pages, its price and makeup were similar to the *Times*. It ran a very able weekly article on trade and finance. It was chiefly owned in the early 'sixties by a stockbroker who had little interest in politics, and its course was determined by the editor, Thomas Walker, and the manager, J. R. Robinson. It was a straightforward Liberal, Harriet Martineau being a mainstay of its editorial columns, but it was not the spokesman of party leaders. In its desire to restrict public expenditure and in its depreciation of war scares, it followed the teaching of the Manchester School rather than the policies of Palmerston. Until the correspondence of Archibald Forbes made its fortune in 1870, however, the paper was not a striking financial success.¹³

average daily circulation. In the 'sixties it was around 60,000, the highest of all years prior to 1914 being 1866. See the *Times*, May 8, 1914, p. 9; Grant, *Newspaper Press*, II, 25; *Critic*, XXV, 185. In 1854 there were in London fourteen dailies; in 1860, twenty, at least four of them being evening editions of morning papers.

¹² Fullerton, *Life of C. K. Spurgeon*, p. 80.

¹³ F. M. Thomas (ed.), *Fifty Years of Fleet Street; the Life and Recollections of Sir John R. Robinson*; J. Hatton, *Journalistic London*, p. 53 ff.; Mrs. F. F. Miller, *Harriet Martineau*, p. 188; Thurlow Weed, *Autobiography*, I, p. 644;

The counterpart of the *Daily News* on the opposite side was the *Morning Herald*, owned in 1860 by an honest, strenuous Conservative who had "practically sacrificed" it in 1857 by converting the old evening *Standard* into a penny morning paper with the same editor and news, though with different leading articles. The two journals were commonly and quite appropriately known as Mrs. Gamp and Mrs. 'Arris. Their editor was a certain Captain Hamber, whose connections with Pall Mall were fully as close as those with Fleet Street. The *Standard* was second in importance of the three penny dailies in the metropolis and was the only cheap journal of downright Tory tendencies at a time when Conservatives were beginning dimly to perceive the need of an alliance with the lower classes. But the *Herald* and *Standard* were not exponents of Conservative party strategy, and the parliamentary leaders seem to have let Hamber go his own gait. The *Standard* gained much in circulation in the early 'sixties through the popularity of slashing letters by a Copperhead correspondent in New York.¹⁴

The newspapers of the metropolis in 1860 reflected accurately party politics. The state of parties at the time of Palmerston's last ministry was not normal, and a fourth of the more expensive journals gave evidence of that fact. The *Morning Post* even then was the fashionable and gentlemanly organ of England, yet it was not hostile to Palmerston; on the contrary, it was known as his mouthpiece. The editor, a high Tory in Church and State, did not see eye to eye with the Minister in all matters, but there was no anomaly in the support of him by the conservatively minded. The *Post* was at this time edited and managed by its later owner, who eventually became one of the first of British "newspaper peers". Until 1865 he was a supporter of Palmerston's foreign policy,

Dictionary of National Biography, Thomas Walker; *Nation* (New York) XXXI, 234; *New Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1861, p. 103. Manuscript diary of Benjamin Moran in the Library of Congress under dates Jan. 1, 18, 19, 23, 1861 and Jan. 10, 1862.

¹⁴T. H. S. Escott, *Masters of English Journalism*, p. 197 ff.; Hatton, *op. cit.*, p. 152; Grant, *Newspaper Press*, I, p. 238; the *Morning Post*, Nov. 17, 1862, called the *Herald* Disraeli's mouthpiece, but the files of that paper do not support the statement; for the *Standard* see H. W. Massingham, *The London Daily Press*, ch. iii.

a sharp critic of his evangelical Church appointments, and moderately conservative on domestic questions in general.¹⁵

More official than the *Post* was the evening *Globe*, which seems to have been the mouthpiece of the Whigs for news, though not for opinion. It printed, for other newspapers rather than for the public, bits of official information and corrections of misstatements made elsewhere in the press,—whatever, in short, the ministry wished to have known of its intimate doings. It was almost the only journal whose news the *Times* quoted, yet its circulation was small, and no one ever thought of it as "powerful" or "influential."¹⁶

The only important non-commercial paper in London was the *Morning Star*, which was supported by its proprietors at considerable expense to themselves until 1870. It was regarded as the organ of John Bright, whose brother-in-law was the editor, but Cobden and Joseph Sturge were more concerned in its foundation. The *Star* never took root in the unfavorable atmosphere of London. Its real trouble was didacticism and dullness; the London public did not like preachments or attacks on the institutions and statesmen under whom the country was happy and prosperous. The staff of the paper was not conspicuously able, though it included Justin McCarthy. The *Daily News* attracted the best of the outside contributors who might have supported the *Star*'s reputation, and the *Star* had no money for attempting notable journalistic feats.¹⁷

From the point of view of general newspaper history, the most interesting journal of 1860 was the penny *Daily Telegraph*. Like the *Standard* and *Star*, it was a product of the repeal of the stamp duty, but it alone of the three adopted the accurate line for popular success and so became the earliest English example of the modern type of journalism. The two

¹⁵ Escott, *op. cit.*, p. 187 ff.; R. Lucas, *Lord Glenesk and the Morning Post*.

¹⁶ Grant, *op. cit.*, II, 71; J. C. Francis, *Notes by the Way*, p. 181; *Nation* (New York), XXXI, 250.

¹⁷ C. A. Cooper, *An Editor's Retrospect; Fifty Years of Newspaper Work*, ch. x; Justin McCarthy, *Reminiscences*, I, chs. v, vi, ix; Grant, *op. cit.*, I, 376 ff.; Hodder, *Life of Samuel Morley*, p. 244; J. A. Hobson, *Cobden, the International Man*, pp. 109, 123, 130, 141; Frederick William Chesson's manuscript diary, which his son kindly lent to me, gives some light from one of the editors, but less than I had hoped.

Jewish editor-proprietors made an appeal akin in quality to the contemporary "rowdyism" of the *New York Herald*, though somewhat more tempered. If the *Times* was "Jupiter Tonans", the *Telegraph* was "Jupiter Junior"; in fact, it admitted that the *Times* "is our most important competitor." As early as 1862 its circulation was estimated at ninety thousand daily; by 1869 it had accumulated a list of subscribers three times as large as that of the *Times*.¹⁸

In addition to these daily journals, there was published in London a group of weekly newspapers, corresponding more or less to the American Sunday paper, but independent of the daily press. The more important of these papers were the *Observer*, the *Sunday Times*, the *Press*, and the *St. James's Chronicle*, but these journals had not yet achieved their later importance.¹⁹

But it is not altogether correct to regard the whole power of the British press as concentrated in London. The metropolis has never been all of England, and the provincial press is worth study. In the first place, there were small weekly papers of little or no political color in almost all of the towns of the United Kingdom. A conspectus of newspapers published in 1861 says that of 809 newspapers in England, 398 were independent or "neuter" in politics.²⁰ The greater number of these were small sheets, often produced by the local printer or stationer, existing chiefly to purvey advertisements and the news of the vicinity. Leading articles were often omitted for weeks at a time; even when they appeared regularly there was no aggressive or consistent editorial policy. The basis of these papers, which usually had four or eight pages, was printed sheets sent out from London which sometimes contained much bald padding.

The two sets of such sheets most often provided in 1861 may be called for convenience "London Inside A" and "Lon-

¹⁸ *Critic*, XXV, 185; Holtzendorff, "Englands Presse", *Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Vorträge*, IV, p. 888; Grant, *op. cit.*, II, p. 90 ff.; Nicoll, James Macdonell, *Journalist*, p. 115 ff.; *Dictionary of National Biography*, article on Joseph Moses Levy.

¹⁹ MSS Diary of Benjamin Moran; *Continental Monthly* (New York), VI, p. 146; Grant, *op. cit.*, III, p. 101 ff.

²⁰ *Newspaper Press Census for 1861* (London, 1861).

don Inside B". An important requirement was that this partly printed material should offend no susceptibilities: in fact, it consisted largely of such news of the week as seemed to be worth reproducing after a lapse of five days, a natural emphasis being placed on startling crimes and inconsequential metropolitan gossip. "Our London Correspondent" in "Inside A," who wrote about a column a week, was suave and urbane, well informed on everything from the price of beef to the contents of Lord Palmerston's mind. His tone was generally liberal, but quite unpartizan, and he continually disclaimed opinions of his own. Occasionally he gave a bit of literary gossip, telling sometimes the reputed names of contributors to the monthlies and quarterlies. Though fond of making little digs at the *Times*, he certainly annoyed no one. "Inside B" was a shade more Palmerstonian than its rival, though its "Outlines of the Week" had a Dissenting tinge. But it was full of a variety of information to suit all palates. In 1860-61 it ran a series of descriptive sketches of prominent members of parliament. Its London correspondent, who signed "Z.Z.", gives the pleasant impression that he moved in the highest social circles, and he wrote lightly and well of all sorts of things.²¹

Two or three country papers may be taken as typical. The *Andover Advertiser*, starting in 1857, issued four pages weekly and subscribed to "Inside A." It stated in 1861 that its circulation was nearly thirteen hundred weekly. In the agricultural region of Hampshire, it was mildly Conservative, but contained almost no politics and few independent leading articles. The *Teesdale Mercury*, published at Barnard Castle in the sheep-raising district of the North Riding and Durham, subscribed to "Inside B." It expressed no opinion in 1860, even on Garibaldi and parliamentary reform, but in 1861 the editor betrayed evidence of interest in American affairs. Its local news was full, but very local. The *Wigton Advertiser* was published after 1857 in a town of 4300 popu-

²¹ I have no complete list of papers using these "Insides," but a great majority of the papers in towns under four or five thousand population subscribed to such a service. Some miscellaneous browsing yielded sixteen papers with "Inside A" and six with "Inside B."

lation about fifteen miles distant from Carlisle in Cumberland. It belonged to the "Inside A" clan and had little independent editorial interest in the early 'sixties, save in the events of the American war.

In the next level above the petty country press were the exponents of local Liberalism or Conservatism in the medium-sized towns. Sometimes there were three, four, or even five papers in a town of twenty-five thousand population, though one was usually dominant; at most there would be two rivals, each with its own political constituency. On the whole, the agricultural regions of southern England were Conservative, the mining and manufacturing parts of the North and the Midlands Liberal, and the press took its tone accordingly. In this stratum there was a tendency to go to extremes and to look with less favor on the Palmerstonian temper. The *Bucks Herald*, Aylesbury, for example, was a stout Tory and Church organ, more Disraelite than Disraeli. To it the mild reform bill of 1860 was "a red hot revolutionary measure"; the Cobden-Chevalier commercial treaty, a betrayal of the national honor and interest. It attacked the Manchester School and the mill owners almost with ferocity. John Bright was its especial *bête noire*, though it reported his speeches. It attacked the *Times* frequently, though not very vigorously, but left Palmerston largely to his own devices. The *West Durham News* (Bishop Auckland), a smaller and less widely circulated sheet, was the organ of the Liberal party in South Durham. Less radical than the school of John Bright, the reform bill of 1860 was to it a "large and judicious installment." It lacked enthusiasm for Palmerston's projects of coast and naval defence, not on principle, but because they were too expensive.

By 1861 all the large seaport and manufacturing towns of England had daily papers, there being usually one or more "leading" journals of each party with often a weekly edition, which had survived from the earlier days of the stamp duty. Frequently these organs, of whichever party, supported Palmerston in an atmosphere of good feeling which only a local bye-election could dissipate. There were, however, intransigent

Tory organs which took their tone and sometimes more from the *Morning Herald* and the *Standard* and were chiefly concerned with defending the Established Church and the constitution while attacking Bright. Examples were the *Newcastle Daily Journal* (weekly to January, 1861), the chief Conservative champion in the North; the *Hull Packet*, of which most of the nobility, gentry, and clergy of the East Riding of Yorkshire were patrons, and the *Birmingham Daily Gazette* (weekly to May, 1862). On the left wing were the exponents of the Manchester School, though they could scarcely be organs of what was not a party. Notwithstanding the repeated charges of Conservatives, they were independent journals run for profit and were as thoroughly colored by the brush of local conditions as by the pencil of *laissez faire* and quasi-democratic doctrines. The leader in this class was the *Manchester Examiner and Times*, owned by old campaigners in the anti-corn law movement and edited by Henry Dunckley, whose weekly leading articles signed "Verax" were long famous in the land. The circulation of the *Examiner* was given in 1862 as forty thousand, and it was a more important paper than its London counterpart, the *Morning Star*.²² Other journals of this sort were the *Birmingham Daily Post*, which advertised its circulation in 1860 as near fifteen thousand; the *Bradford Review* (weekly); the *Huddersfield Examiner* (weekly); the *Sunderland Times* (bi-weekly). Representing an extreme radicalism was the *Newcastle Chronicle* (daily and weekly), the personally supervised property of a man who was later well known on the national political stage. Newcastle had nursed the embers of dying Chartism, and Joseph Cowen the younger, a prosperous manufacturer of fire-clay products, led the *Chronicle* and a Northern Reform Union in a demand for three of the unattained points of the old Charter: manhood suffrage, the secret ballot, and the abolition of the property qualification for members of parliament.

Between these extremes was a large number of able journals, daily and weekly, which took their tone less from national questions than the exigencies of local conditions and

²² Grant, *op. cit.*, III, p. 388; *Critic*, XXV, 185.

which in many cases were organs of economic or social rather than political groups. A majority of the important papers outside of London were in this class. Examples were the *Sussex Agricultural Express*, Lewes (biweekly), the chief of a chain of twenty similar papers largely in the south of England; the *Leeds Mercury*, an organ in the country of the views of the larger Dissenting denominations; the *Manchester Guardian*, which represented the views of the great cotton spinners and followed in the footsteps of the *Times*; the *Liverpool Daily Post*, which was in the early 'sixties the best written and the most independent journal noted outside of London. On the same plane was the *Liverpool Mercury*, which was decidedly Liberal, but neither Whig nor Radical; it agreed with the London *Daily News* on most matters of national policy.

However a majority of the weekly periodicals in London did not belong in the category of the newspaper; even in 1860 these weeklies were of diverse sorts with innumerable points of view. Most widely circulated of all English journals was a group of papers which catered to working-class readers. The largest of these was *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*, which increased in circulation from one hundred seventy-five to four hundred thousand between 1860 and 1865. It appeared in five editions between Friday and Sunday and after October, 1861, was sold for a penny. It was made up primarily of reading matter designed to entertain and interest its constituency, but it did not shirk political questions and was consistently, though not vituperatively, radical in tone. Resembling it was *Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper* with a circulation almost as large and a more radical tone. Grant said of it in 1870 that "though it would, if it could, overthrow the Throne tomorrow, it is otherwise an excellent journal." Similar in type to these two were the *Weekly Times*, which was not excessively radical, and the *Weekly Despatch*, the most virulent and scurrilous sheet I have seen, though it sold for five pence as contrasted with the penny charged by its rivals. The *News of the World* advertised the largest circulation in the Kingdom, but it was read chiefly in the provinces. Though

ostensibly Liberal, it had no aggressive policy and subsisted largely on quoted articles. All of these papers were widely circulated outside of London.²³

There were also papers with particular economic or social points of view, such as the *Bee Hive*, the organ of the London trades unions, of which no file seems to be available for the 'sixties;²⁴ the *Economist*, edited by Walter Bagehot and probably the most important of the financial and trade journals; the *Mining Journal*; the *Money Market Review*; and the *Mark Lane Express*, which was the organ of the British grain trade, though it had a rival in the *Magnet*. Then there were sporting and theatrical papers, such as *Bell's Life in London* and rival sporting sheets which had sprung up since 1855; the *Era*, which specialized in freemasonry and the theater; and the *Court Journal*, whose province was the world of fashion.

Unique in their fields were *Punch* and the *Illustrated London News*, which were for many years able to kill or absorb the many rivals which their success brought into being. The latter paper carried a larger amount of informational text than in later times and was, of course, invariably found in reading rooms of clubs and hotels. *Punch* in its own way filled a place similar in some respects to that of the *Times*, being all things to all men in a hearty Palmerstonian fashion. Its policies were determined by the editors in conclave at their famous weekly dinners at which the subject and tone of the single big cartoon for the week was agreed upon, the artist simply carrying out instructions. This cartoon had all the force and prestige of a leading article and was frequently supported by a page of verse on the same theme.²⁵

The religious press deserves a dissertation and must have a paragraph to itself. Its influence is almost impossible to estimate, all the more difficult in that the Nonconformists were able to eliminate any tabulation of their numbers from the

²³ Grant, *op. cit.*, III, p. 42 ff., 98; *Critic*, XXV, 185; Hatton, *Journalistic London*, p. 193 ff.; Bourne, *English Newspapers*, II, p. 254; the *Times*, Sept. 1, 1860, and advertisements of *Lloyd's* therein in 1861.

²⁴ The only one I have found trace of is owned by Mr. John Burns, who loaned it to the London School of Economics, which lost it, temporarily it is to be hoped, in moving.

²⁵ M. H. Spielmann, *The History of Punch*; A. W. à Beckett, *The à Becketts of Punch*; G. S. Layard, *A Great Punch Editor: Shirley Brooks*; C. L. Graves, *Mr. Punch's History of Modern England*, 4 vols.

census of 1861 and British Dissent in the nineteenth century still awaits a historian. The Established and Roman Churches had their internal divisions and parties as well as the lesser sects, and all types of religious and ecclesiastical opinion, from the extreme ultramontane and High Church to the finer shades of Unitarianism and theism, were represented in the press. There were no fewer than thirty-five papers in 1864, each with its peculiar tinge, and the list would be much larger if local or Sunday-School publications were included. These papers frequently commented on secular affairs as well as matters in their own field.²⁶

Finally, the politico-critical and literary reviews deserve mention. The founding of the *Saturday Review* in 1855 is regarded as marking an epoch in the history of periodical literature, and in the early 'sixties that review, with a circulation of some ten thousand, earned by the quality of its contents the prestige it had among English intellectuals. It was owned by Beresford Hope, a pillar of the High Church party and a Tory to the bone, and edited by John Douglass Cook, formerly editor of the Peelite *Morning Chronicle*. The function of the *Saturday* was mordant criticism, and the autobiographies of writers of all shades of opinion show in after years how diverse were the views and how fast the pace set in the early days. Thackeray called it the "Superfine Review", Bright the "Saturday Reviler," and if its enemies were less numerous than those of the *Times*, they were more bitter.²⁷

If the *Saturday Review* had a rival it was the *Spectator*, which in 1861 passed into new and more capable hands. Jointly owned and edited for over thirty-five years by Meredith Townsend and R. H. Hutton, it gained constantly until in the 'eighties it became a political and literary arbiter more respected and powerful, if less feared, than the *Saturday* had been in its

²⁶ Holtzendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 902; Grant, *op. cit.*, III, p. 147. The *Christian World*, one of the more general Dissenting papers, was reported in 1869 to have a hundred thousand subscribers.

²⁷ See X, 445 (Oct. 13, 1860) for an article on the tour of the Prince of Wales in America which is illustrative. Goldwin Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 166, says that the tone of the review was epicurean, and "this was the source of its popularity in the circles by which it was chiefly supported. It was said by us that whereas with the generation of the Reform Bill, everything had been new, everything had been true, and everything had been of the highest importance, with us nothing was new, nothing true, and nothing of any importance."

palmiest days. But prior to 1865 it lost money, owing to its advocacy of the Broad Church views of F. D. Maurice, and its trenchant if kindly criticism did not atone for the unpopularity incurred by a steady support of the Northern side in the American Civil War. The *Spectator* was always addressed to gentlefolk.²⁸

The other weekly reviews were inferior. The *Examiner*, remembered for earlier days under the brothers Hunt and Albany Fonblanque, was now of as little weight as circulation. It was Whig in tendency with emphasis on leading articles. The *London Review*, established in 1860 as a rival of the *Saturday*, lasted only a few years. *John Bull*, "the favourite organ of the gentlemen of England," was a very simple paper, always straightforward, dogmatic, thoroughly Tory, and High Church.²⁹ Literary criticism appeared in the *Athenaeum*, whose book reviews had great weight, and in its brief rival, the *Critic*, which expired in 1863. There were also a number of weeklies, such as Dickens' *Once a Week* and the Religious Tract Society's *Leisure Hour*, which confined themselves to short stories, sketches, travel, and the like.

A contemporary, not an Englishman, concluded that the English press of this time supplied the general reader with more and better pabulum than was offered to his contemporary anywhere in Europe.³⁰ In a day when the free moments

²⁸ Holtzendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 893 ff. of the unleisured classes were rarer than now, the weekly papers were more important relatively to daily papers than was to be the case later, but the daily gained ground constantly. By popularizing general information and advocating still unwon causes the journals contributed a large share to the democratization of England. The monthly and quarterly reviews had taken the place of pamphlets, so that discussion of any topic was free and open to all who would read, and many did so, if only for the reason that the prohibition of smoking in railway carriages and tram cars made something necessary to while away the time.

²⁹ Escott, *Masters of English Journalism*, p. 239; Hogben, *R. H. Hutton of the Spectator*; *Dictionary of National Biography*, articles on Hutton and Townsend.

³⁰ Grant, *op. cit.*, III, p. 45 ff.; Bourne, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 53, 289; Charles Mackay, *Through the Long Day*, II, ch. vii.

BOOK REVIEWS

WITCHCRAFT IN OLD AND NEW ENGLAND. By George Lyman Kittredge. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1929. 641 pp.

Folk-lore, one of the most comprehensive fields for scholarly research, was something other than folk-lore to the poor ancients who never knew they were ancients. To them it was religion and science. To our posterity (waiving the question as to what some of our actual contemporaries think) our own science and religion may, just conceivably, appear to be largely folk-lore. It is a great pity, then, that work in such a significant field of study should today be often considered a bastard form of scholarship, mainly because it has been pawed over with such ignorant enthusiasm by flimsy amateurs. Professor Kittredge's book lays several venerable ghosts directly, but by far its greatest value lies in the indirect and pervasive refutation of the idea that folk-lore is a study to be treated with tolerant contempt.

Historically, Professor Kittredge abolishes the accepted notion that witchcraft in England was a comparatively sudden flareup under James I and substitutes a concept of witchcraft as an integral part of English life, recognized by the law and the church, from Anglo-Saxon times till long after its elimination, not under James, but under Elizabeth. He shows that the New England witchcraft trials were not the product of isolated intolerant bigotry, but differed from contemporary European trials only in the greater judgment with which they were prosecuted and in the fact that they were the only such trials which were publicly and officially repented of. All witchcraft trials arose from the conviction of the normal public that the accused had done actual damage to individuals. They were based upon personal fear, not upon mere theological or legalistic theory. This fact, which Mr. Kittredge establishes and stresses from first to last, makes of witchcraft a very human manifestation instead of a monstrous anachronism. In fact, for most of the fourteen or fifteen phases of witchcraft treated, Mr. Kittredge easily cites not only ancient analogies far antedating Saxon England, but also instances from twentieth century records. The book contains abundant facts which support the author's general conclusion that the belief in witchcraft, almost universal in the seventeenth century, is in some form or other still maintained by the majority of humanity today.

The extraordinary learning and research on which the study is based is evidenced not only in the main text, but in the 366 pages of notes drawn from the ecclesiastical, legal, and literary records of most

of the major languages of western Europe, from classical times to the present day. A chance reference in one chapter to a note taken over thirty years ago indicates that they are the product of at least thirty years of study. It goes without saying that such ripe and abundant use of minute and particular knowledge furnishes many valuable clues for the specialist in witchcraft. The chief virtue of the book, however, as well as the chief basis of its remarkable general interest, is the startling way in which a supposedly abnormal subject is humanized. That this must have been a major purpose of the author is characteristically indicated by the last of his general conclusions: "21. It is easy to be wise after the fact—especially when the fact is two hundred years old."

NEWMAN I. WHITE.

THE AFTERMATH. By the Rt. Hon. Winston S. Churchill. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929. 505 pp.

The flood of publications dealing with the post-war problems of Europe never ceases, but none exceeds in interest and importance this volume, which is the fourth of Churchill's series on the *World Crisis*. His experience as Secretary of State for War in the Lloyd George post bellum cabinet, and more particularly his official position as Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Baldwin ministry, give it the character of a political as well as a literary event. It is therefore significant not merely as an account of certain crucial questions from 1918 to 1922, as interpreted by one whose influence was of considerable weight in determining the course of events, but also as an illustration of the psychology of those who have shaped British foreign policy. A personal narrative in the sense that Churchill selects those questions in which his part has been the subject of controversy, it is by no means a balanced survey of the international situation during the period with which he is most concerned. He has little to say of the League of Nations, of England's part in the application of the Peace Treaties, or of her relations with France after the Peace Conference. His treatment, however, of the Conference itself, the Russian Revolution and the question of intervention, the Irish problem, and the Greco-Turkish War of 1921-1922 in its relation to British policy throws much light upon his part in these matters and also upon the policy of the Foreign Office.

The author's literary talents have never been so clearly revealed. Passages that are worth quoting appear on almost every page. But his brilliant rhetoric, his clear-cut analysis and vivid characterizations should not overshadow his innate predilection for the ideals and meth-

ods of diplomacy which liberals would like to think of as belonging to the past. "The conclusion of the Great War," so runs his opening sentence, "raised England to the highest position she had yet attained." After the world had been drenched in blood during four endless years, he is moved to give first place among the war's results to his country's success in defeating the effort of the strongest military Power to seize the Belgian coast. He is profoundly critical of Wilsonian idealism and its effect upon the Peace Conference, but this irritation is merely typical of the reaction of the conservative leaders of every European Power to the American assumption of moral superiority to the statecraft of the Old World. His point of view in regard to the Russian Revolution is of political significance in view of his membership in a ministry which at least pretends to live on friendly terms with the present government of Russia. It does not matter to him that Lenin, rightly or wrongly, is venerated by the Russian people: he is disposed of in a few well-turned phrases. "Implacable vengeance, rising from a frozen pity in a tranquil, sensible, matter-of-fact, good-humoured integument! . . . His sympathies cold and wide as the Arctic Ocean; his hatreds as tight as the hangman's noose. His purpose to save the world; his method to blow it up. . . . His body . . . is conserved in pickle for the curiosity of the Moscow public and for the consolation of the faithful." If Churchill's advice had been followed, the Western Powers would have intervened effectively on behalf of the "white" armies. Thirty thousand seasoned soldiers, he believed, might at one time have marched to Moscow! His own account is not notable for its sympathetic understanding of the difficulties confronting the Russian people. As for the future prospects of peace, he finds that the best guaranty is in the Locarno Pact, but he has a good, if not enthusiastic, word to say for the League of Nations. Many dangers of war still exist, he writes, and more frightful weapons of destruction than ever before are ready at hand. "Death stands at attention, obedient, expectant, ready to serve, ready to shear away peoples *en masse*; ready, if called on, to pulverize, without hope of repair, what is left of civilization."

E. MALCOLM CARROLL.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THOMAS CARLYLE'S WRITINGS AND ANA. By Isaac Watson Dyer. Portland, Maine: The Southworth Press, 1928. 587 pp.

At last the great, almost uncharted sea of "Carlyle literature" has found an able navigator. Here in Mr. Isaac W. Dyer's bibliography of Carlyle the librarian and the scholar may be safely guided through the doldrums of odd and undated editions, into sunny spaces where

shine the great contributions to Carlylean lore, in and among biographies (good and bad), and monographs and sermons and letters and articles and speeches and reminiscences. Thus it is with a literary figure more significant for moral force than for any practical solution to our problems. Like Byron, who was greater than his words, Carlyle attracts the popular mind, which seeks to know him through innumerable popular expositions. The bibliographer's task is consequently colossal. In the present case, however, the difficulties peculiar to such a task have been skilfully overcome. Mr. Dyer's *Bibliography* falls into two main divisions, the bibliography proper and the *ana*. In the first section come the chronological list of writings, then the same list alphabetically and in more detail, a check-list of periodicals in which Carlyle's writings first appeared, and finally a list of magazines, papers, etc., containing Carlyle's letters. The *ana* are arranged first by the name of the author and second by the title of the magazine; to these are added two pleasantly unexpected sections, a list by Mr. J. A. S. Barrett of the principal portraits, statues, busts, and photographs of Carlyle, and a commentary by Mr. James L. Caw, of the National Galleries of Scotland, on Carlyle's portraits. Four Appendixes contain material on Carlyle's invention of a new horse-shoe, a note on the sources of *The French Revolution*, another on certain aspects of *Sartor Resartus*, and addenda to the magazine list in the *ana*. Such a method, together with the exhaustiveness of the work as a whole, leaves little to be desired by either the general reader or the specialist. Hitherto one had recourse only to the two short (though excellent) bibliographies by R. H. Shepherd (1881) and J. P. Anderson (at the end of Garnett's *Life of Carlyle*, London, 1887). When one had also consulted the Jones Collection at the library of the University of Michigan and the Harvard collection of Carlyle's sources for his *Frederick* and his *Cromwell*, one had practically exhausted available bibliographical aid. Happily this predicament no longer faces the Carlylean who wishes to survey the vast body of writing by and on (especially *on*) Thomas Carlyle.

Several features combine to make Mr. Dyer's book particularly satisfactory. In the first place, the Southward Press has given the work a format, a typography, and a marginalation that dignify it to a worthy place beside any bibliography the reviewer has seen. The heavy buckram, unadorned, in massive black, with the title and author indicated only on the back strip, makes a very appropriate dress for a book that will receive frequent and trying use. In the next place, turning to the contents, the reader will find the bibliographical lists

suspended occasionally by commentary varying in length from a single line to ten pages of fine type. Thus at the end of the *Sartor* list we have a lengthy and fascinating account of that work under such headings as "Genesis of the Book," "Struggle for Publication," "Characters and Places," "Text," "Style," "First Reception," "Edited Editions," and "Review and Comment." Indeed, considering the long and yet compact notes on the Froude-Carlyle controversy, the inception of *The French Revolution*, and each major work of Carlyle's, we cannot help concluding that a careful reading of the work would give one virtually all the important facts about Carlyle. The book thus becomes more than a mere bibliography; it is also a varied field in which the reader of Carlyle may browse among delightful literary morsels.

The inclusiveness of the bibliography is yet another satisfying feature. Mr. Dyer has apparently ransacked the ends of Carlyle-dom for the least of *ana*, in whatever language they might appear. He has exercised discretion, however, in listing the various editions of Carlyle's collected works; in a footnote on page 57 he writes that "No attempt has been made to include recent editions not deemed of value to the collector, or not having some special points of excellence for the general reader." Thus we do not find listed such an unattractive edition as that by Collier, New York, 1897. Opinion may differ as to Mr. Dyer's wisdom in thus excluding many popular and cheap editions. The Carlyle scholar may, if he is formally exacting, demand the listing of many an edition which he would scorn to notice. The question is one upon which bibliographers have not as yet seemed to arrive at unanimity. Another, and more vital, question concerns the degree of error in Mr. Dyer's work. Aside from a handful of proof-reader's errors, it seems on present examination to be admirably exact and accurate. No bibliography can perhaps be expected to reach absolute perfection. One can imagine the bibliographer's prayer, ". . . and may my percentage of error be less, O Lord!"

The six hundred copies of the bibliography to which the Southworth Press limited itself, will undoubtedly find their way to the shelves of all important libraries. Interest in Carlyle, perhaps the most picturesque figure in English literature, has been waxing in these latter years as the Victorian era has softened in outline while receding in the past. To understand much in that many-minded era one must understand its most vehement prophet. Mr. Dyer's bibliography will serve as a map not only for the mind and influence of Carlyle, but also for the many currents that eddied around and near him.

CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD.

Michigan State Normal College.

GEORGE W. CABLE: HIS LIFE AND LETTERS. By Lucy Leffingwell Cable Biklé. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928. xiii, 306 pp.

It is not strange that Lucy Leffingwell Cable Biklé should be the one of George W. Cable's daughters to write her father's biography, for the temperamental kinship as well as the physical resemblance between these two was of the closest. The disadvantages of her relationship to her subject are more than outweighed by her adoption of a biographical creed which she borrows from him: "The wise story-teller, though not bound to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth, is bound to reverence it above all things; substituting in place of the actual the harmoniously supposable; yet only in so far as the actual is less effective for his ends—the ministry of right emotions. . . ."

The chief contribution of Mrs. Biklé to a fair estimate of the man Cable is likely to be just this harmonizing of the seemingly diverse elements of his personality. To the critics Cable has always been something of an enigma. He was sometimes pagan, sometimes Puritan, never wholly realist, always partially idealist, and a man whose loyalties were strangely divided between North and South in days when such division was something of a perversion. To Mrs. Biklé the contradictions in her father's nature were more apparent than real. Nowhere is this more evident than in the brief characterization of him which prefaces the book. The author of *Dr. Sevier* and *The Grandissimes* might well be pleased with the charm and vividness of his daughter's description.

To her assistance the "wise story-teller" has brought eighteen splendid illustrations and a wealth of her father's letters, quotations from his published and unpublished works, and excerpts from his diaries—all of which reveal as nothing else could a man whose adventures fell so frequently within the realm of his own thoughts and feelings. Wherever her material permits, the author abandons the rôle of narrator for the more difficult one of editor.

From first to last the moral energy of Cable's English antecedents and the sensuous excitability of the Latins among whom he spent the impressionable years of his youth seem not so much to have warred within him as to have alternated in their domination of his moods. Not poverty, nor responsibility, war or personal bereavements (of which he suffered many) ever succeeded in quenching his response to beauty, which was manifest not only in his writings but in his passionate love of gardens, and this to him meant flowers, birds, trees, and friendly contacts with his neighbors. That he cultivated a scanty plot of literary ground which produced, however, a full harvest is indicated by the bibliography of his works appended to the book.

Much of the interest of this story of a quaint teller of stories attaches to the intimate glimpses it affords of a number of prominent men whose paths crossed his from time to time, such men as Lafcadio Hearn, Joseph Pennell, Henry Ward Beecher, Richard Watson Gilder, J. M. Barrie, and Andrew Carnegie, to mention names. Some of the Mark Twain anecdotes have not been told before.

Such was Mr. Cable's feeling for detail that a mistake in spelling like the one on page 216, *rythm* for *rhythm*, would have nettled him considerably. But this annoyance would have soon given way to satisfaction in having been the first to spy, and in his greater pleasure in the general high quality of another Scribner publication.

JANICE OZIAS COLLINS.

WHILE PETER SLEEPS. By E. Boyd Barrett. New York: Ives Washburn, Inc., 1929. x, 321 pp.

Dr. Barrett's book marks an era. There have been many scathing critics of Romanism within the Church of Rome: none surpassing in fervor or equalling in results those that we call the Reformers. But Dr. Barrett, without animosity, and with a searching and thorough criticism, proposes similar organic protests, facing the probability of similar results. He is still a Catholic, and technically still a priest. Having spent twenty years in the Jesuit Order, he secured his demit and is now practicing psycho-analysis in New York. His experience gives him a thoroughness of information impossible to the non-Catholic. His earlier book, *The Jesuit Enigma*, is of a much larger caliber than other books by ex-Jesuits that have come in the reviewer's way.

For Dr. Barrett, Romanism is not Catholicism, but the result of historic usurpations of authority. With these usurpations overthrown, American Catholics by democratic methods would get rid of the evils of which they complain. This reviewer has lived for many years in contact with strong Catholic communities, and has many Catholic friends, and has been keenly interested in the growing spirit of protest among democratically-inclined Catholics. It is this very powerful element in American Catholicism that finds a voice in Dr. Barrett's book. The encyclical of Pius X against "Modernism" was aimed at a few scholars like Loisy, Tyrrell, Murri, Fogazzaro, and Sabatier who undertook "to reinterpret Catholicism in the terms of modern thought." James Sullivan's reply, *Letters to His Holiness Pius X*, showed how little awed by the encyclical was American Catholic scholarship. But this scholastic protest did not voice the needs and longings of the Catholic middle-class.

Dr. Barrett emphasizes the defects of Catholic education, of the confessional, of the mistaken teachings about sex and marriage and celibacy based upon mediaeval physiology. The abolition of the ancient popular councils and government by fear and the tyranny of the Jesuit Order are searchingly reviewed. The scant attention to the Bible and the fostering of superstitions would disappear from a democratic and educated Catholic church. Especially Dr. Barrett recognizes that the great middle class of American Catholics do not and will not support Papal claims to secular supremacy. "The average American Catholic has unconsciously and insensibly assimilated the prevalent 'liberalist' views of his day. He is unaware of the contradiction between his mental outlook on political philosophy and the outlook of his church. The priests, even the bishops of this country, have like the lay Catholics assimilated the doctrine of liberalism. Some of them have made efforts to find justification for their tenets in Catholic theology, but their efforts have failed. They have given up in despair the impossible task of reconciling the 'syllabus' of Pius X and their attitude towards the modern state."

So Dr. Barrett urges return to the ancient popular weapon, the national council of mixed clergy and laity: "in England even *abbesses* were occasionally present at mixed synods." The activity of laymen in such an American National Council is to be emphasized, and the council should be more democratic than those of the early church, open to the press, and with decisions taken by ballot. Such a council, having ended "the miserable trafficking in religious objects and practices that brings so much shame on Catholicism," would then be in a position to make itself heeded at the Ecumenical Council, and by the Holy See. And as to dogma: "Perhaps in the end the solution of the baffling problem of dogma will be found in the formulation and declaration of a final dogma to the effect that as the Church grows, in body and mind, she must forever be busy reclothing her body and mind; the former in newer, whiter garments, the latter in truer, simpler language; that she must step by step rid herself of wornout customs, doctrines, and dogmas. But will such a dogma ever be accepted by the infallible *magisterium* at Rome? And if it is not accepted,—what then?"

ALLEN H. GODBEY.

OUR RECOVERY OF JESUS. By Walter E. Bundy. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1929. 350 pp.

Dr. Bundy reviews the historic struggle of scholars beginning with Strauss to recover the Jesus of the New Testament as a religious human

subject instead of a cultus-and-credo-object. "Christianity as *a religion about Jesus* has almost totally obscured Christian vision for *the religion of Jesus*,"—"Such study of the life of Jesus as has been undertaken within the church at large has been so strongly dominated by the theological, homiletical, exegetical and traditional point of view that the resultant picture has not been a reproduction of Jesus as he thought and taught, preached and prayed, but rather a picture in the colors of the Christian imagination, and quite far from the Jesus of history. It has resulted in the recovery of Jesus and his religious experience for the church itself."—The effort to recover him has had to recognize that "the historical and psychological situations of the first and second centuries no longer exist," and that "leading men of the modern Orient who reject outright official and organized Christianity as the dry crust of Western civilization are quite inclined to look to Jesus as the bread of life." The Apostle's Creed, save in the opening sentence, omits all of the personal faith of Jesus and skips the whole of the life of Jesus: yet it was his life alone that gave him original significance. "He did not require that his disciples believe certain things about him, but that they believe *with* him, that they share his faith in God and His kingdom—a much more difficult task." Against imaginative and schematic theological pictures, "Jesus should be the sole and absolute authority in all matters pertaining to the substance of the Christian faith, for everything essentially, though not historically, Christian is to be found in his religious life and experience."—"Christianity today is in need less of a restatement of its faith, more of a rehabilitation of Jesus to his rightful place as the actual rather than the theoretical authority. Jesus has stated his faith and ours clearly enough."—The New Testament documents center their interest upon a dying Saviour and a risen Lord, in order to fit Jesus into an intellectual tradition. But the actual earthly Jesus, instead of a theoretical heavenly one, is our need. Critical quests for the living religious Jesus of Nazareth spring from a deep dissatisfaction with the traditional picture of him; "out of a sense of the sharp disparity between the orthodox and official conception and the Jesus of the Gospels." For some devout inquirers, "the careful and critical approach to Jesus has become the only way of personal religious salvation."

Dr. Bundy emphasizes the fact that the New Testament writers presented Jesus as meeting their psychological necessities; but theirs are not ours; and we have to pass through and beyond their psychological terrain to reach the historical Jesus. The way back to him leads through their faith and the fictions of that faith, to fact. But the

skeptical conclusion that "we can neither write a life of Jesus nor present an accurate picture of his personality," Dr. Bundy does not share. Yet he recognizes that the success of every personal "quest for the Jesus of history will be only relative, never absolute." This is also true of all who seek to portray the real Lincoln or the real Robert E. Lee. But "Jesus is worth seeking and seeing, even if we cannot find and see him whole."

Dr. Bundy's tracing of the steps in this critical historical quest, each reader must consider for himself. A variety of religious experiences interpret Jesus in the New Testament, and any reader may find that none of these personal experiences is his own. Through his own personal experience Dr. Bundy finds the Galilean genius whose own spiritual life and power "claims and commands the hearts of men; that supplies men as individuals and as groups with those inner resources that are necessary for the living of the human life religiously." In like manner the success of any seeker for the personal Jesus will depend upon his own psychological and religious attitude. We shall find what we have fitted ourselves to find.

Dr. Bundy has produced a great book in simple language, inspiring alike to the popular reader and the experienced sermonizer.

A. H. GODBEY.

THE ANECDOTES AND EGOTISMS OF HENRY MACKENZIE, 1754-1831. Edited with an Introduction by Harold William Thompson, A.M., Ph.D., F.S.A. Scot. New York: Oxford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1927. xxxiv, 303 pp.

The body of this book consists of anecdotes and incidents narrated by a tolerant octogenarian with a wide acquaintance among men prominent in his time. In a long life he became almost an institution in his native country, but he was too kindly in spirit to wish to offend any one in the slightest degree, and he knew that some of his acquaintances were "so sensitive as to be angry at being alluded to in print." Therefore, these harmless jottings, products of his discursive old age, escaped publication in his lifetime and are now of value chiefly as incidental remains of a literary figure of some importance for other reasons.

The introduction by the editor is written with considerable feeling for style and appreciation of the literary atmosphere in which Mackenzie lived, but with a knowledge much less sure of the history of Great Britain in that time. In trying to arrange in chapters material so utterly disconnected in character Mr. Thompson faced a difficult task; an alternative would have been not to undertake what could not be done

successfully, which would at least have prevented such inconsistencies as placing a paragraph on "The Old Scot's Magazine" in a chapter on The Forty-Five, and another on "Newspapers and Magazines" in a chapter on Men and Letters.

The rest of the critical matter, for the most part, is contained in forty-eight pages called a "Biographical Index," the value of which is doubtful save as it is an index. Much of that which constitutes its bulk is irrelevant where it is not superfluous. For example, Mackenzie noted in eight lines of print that George III crept through Herschel's telescope and induced two bishops to do likewise, which performance the "King of Prussia" desired to come to England to repeat. This paragraph inspired the editor, properly enough, though needlessly, to note that Herschel was an "astronomer." Of the identity of the King of Prussia referred to, which was the sole item in doubt, he does not inform us. But of George III he records: "reigned from 1760; at first influenced largely by Lord Bute, who was Secretary of State in 1761 and First Minister in 1762." Naturally some of the entries are more useful than this one, and being at the end of the book, none of them disturbs one's enjoyment of the good-humored conversation of a garrulous old man.

W. T. LAPRADE.

THE LIFE OF RICHARD ROLLE, TOGETHER WITH AN EDITION OF HIS ENGLISH LYRICS. By Frances M. M. Comper. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1929. xx, 340 pp.

England has not been fecund of mystics and has been negligent of her few. Richard Rolle, who died at the time of the Black Death in 1349 and missed canonization apparently as a result of the extraordinary depletion of the religious in Yorkshire—three-fourths of the population are said to have died of the plague then—was one of these few, and he is hardly known outside the text books of Middle English. Two recent books, however, supplementing the editions of his writings, should help to establish him as more than a name: Miss Allen's scholarly work on the canon and "Materials for His Biography," and this complementary volume by Miss Comper, which is a sympathetic interpretation of his inner life. Its value lies in the skill with which it ekes out our actual knowledge by the constructive imagination by filling in the historical background, and by extracting autobiographical information from what Rolle has left us.

Richard lived in an age of mystics, but he was not one of them. He was a natural rather than a professed mystic. He left Oxford early,

untrained as a thinker and impatient of formal doctrine, and fled to Yorkshire to become an active "hermit." When he speaks, then, it is not as a humbler St. Teresa or St. John of the Cross, but as one who yearns spontaneously for the ecstatic communion of the spirit. There is a well-known distinction between active or *acquired* contemplation and passive or *infused* contemplation; and Rolle's is of the latter sort. His is the mysticism described by Dom Cuthbert Butler as "pre-Dionysian, pre-scholastic, non-philosophical; unaccompanied by psycho-physical concomitants. . . . It is a mysticism purely and solely religious, objective and empirical; being merely, on the practical side, the endeavour of the soul to mount to God in prayer, and seek union with Him and surrender itself wholly to His love; and on the theoretical side, just the endeavour to describe first-hand experiences of the personal relations between the soul and God in contemplation and union." Richard's description of the spiritual life is therefore more vague than that of the other mystics, whose ecstasies are "acquired" and so in a way conscious. Probably the most striking account of his experience is that of the three stages of his conversion—*calor*, *canor*, *dulcor*—which are also the three stages of exaltation whereby the mystic achieves his alienation from the world and the flesh, his escape from the outer to the inner life, his segregation unto the Divine. The *calor* is the fervor and "heat of everlasting love"; the *canor* is the "joyful," "ghostly song"; the *dulcor* is the culminating sense of divine sweetness and purity. Yet these are but feeble attempts of language to express the incommunicable.

Some notion of the *canor* we might expect from Richard's own lyrical verse. But in the nineteen poems which (with rather full notes) make up Part II of Miss Comper's volume, we hear no poet singing. There is a kind of simple genuineness about them, but their music is for the inner ear. To be sure, their poetic quality suffers a little from the editor's semi-modernized versions; yet they are "natural" songs, without skill and without art. The language of his time and the lack of models were against him, and not only was he no literary pioneer, but his Yorkshire wolds could not be expected to grow the *Fioretti* of a St. Francis. As so often happens, his poetry is in his prose, and in this he may be called, if one will, a great religious poet, full of impulsive energy, a noble sweetness, and an eager simplicity. Mystics are not easy to deal with; but it is to be hoped that after Miss Allen's scholarly monograph and Miss Comper's sympathetic interpretation, some one will give us the book which will put Rolle in his deserved place and give him his due recognition.

PAULL F. BAUM.

AN ANTHOLOGY OF RECENT PHILOSOPHY. Compiled by Daniel Sommer Robinson, Ph.D. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1929. xi, 674 pp.

A HISTORY OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY. By Horatio W. Dresser, Ph.D. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1928. xiv, 471 pp.

Up to date this anthology is the only one of its class. Nowhere else is there focussed such a width and variety of current philosophical opinion expressed in the philosopher's own words and written in the first instance, not for an assemblage of views, but for all the many types of occasion productive of scholarly utterance. The volume is thus uniquely rich and fresh. There are sixty-eight excerpts, and these are grouped under five main heads: Orientation, Idealism, Realism, Pragmatism, and Other Types of Philosophy. A few passages which rank as little philosophical masterpieces are here: William James on temperament in philosophy and Samuel Alexander on the emergent Deity; many brief central statements by the lords of recent philosophy, F. H. Bradley, Bosanquet, B. Russell, Bergson, Dewey, Croce, Royce; and several dozen contributions by slightly less well-known writers, who either add some subtlety to a classic argument or represent a minor movement, as James H. Ryan on the New Scholasticism. The editor has worked hard to make this complex material available for students by the addition of biographical sketches, analyses, and questions for discussion. But the result is scarcely, as he claims, food for "beginners." There are too many passages that seem fragmentary in spite of all, and some are indefensibly intricate, as Kemp Smith on "The Nature and Functions of the *Sensa*," and C. D. Broad on "Critical and Speculative Philosophy." Certain classifications are puzzling, not to say absolutely mistaken. So far as I know J. E. Creighton was not an "Absolute Idealist."

The second volume here considered supplements the same author's *History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*. It contains two main parts, "From Bacon to Kant," divided into fifteen sections, and "From Immanuel Kant to the Present Time," divided into fifty. In a handy, if not slender, book the writer has achieved an encyclopedic inclusiveness of names, facts, events, and the external formulas of ideas. He has even succeeded in devoting to some of the great men—Kant and Hegel, for instance—as much as thirty-odd pages, and he marshalls an astonishing number of little "successors," Mansel and J. D. Morell, among others. The book also has the advantage of a relatively extended and detailed treatment of the philosophy of the recent past. What one misses is any fresh presentation of an idea or any penetration to a hidden meaning. One feels that the student's nor-

mal approach would be that of the rote memory, and that at the end of this particular academic chapter, he would remain intellectually innocent. But it is only fair to add that many other histories of philosophy and many courses in that subject are also, to use Croce's pregnant phrase, dead chronologies.

KATHERINE GILBERT.

THE FUNERAL ELEGY AND THE RISE OF ENGLISH ROMANTICISM. By John W. Draper. New York: The New York University Press, 1929. xvi, 358 pp.

This is a kind of companion volume to Professor Draper's collection of *A Century of Broadside Elegies*. Here he has, by the methods of scholarship, extracted the essence of the great quantities of funeral elegies composed in the hundred and fifty years from Charles I to George II, and studied them not for themselves but for the historical meaning behind them. The work was worth doing, is well done, and will not want doing again. We are grateful to Dr. Draper for his labor of diligence and patience and understanding.

The funeral elegy had its beginnings in the aristocratic school of Donne, where it was a genuine lament; then it was taken over by the Cavaliers for purposes of propaganda, and later by the Puritans as a species of indulgence in raw emotionalism. Under the Puritan aegis it made its way into Scotland and the American Colonies. With the rise of the Whigs, the growing importance of the middle classes at the turn of the seventeenth to the eighteenth century, and the establishment in the eighteenth century of the bourgeoisie, the funeral elegy became in a sense the poetic voice of the people. It fell in with the prevalent sentimental trend, and even reached an eminence in the so-called Graveyard School of Young and Gray.

The form is of course a poor relation of literature, but Professor Draper has almost made it a member of the family. Not that he is under any illusion as to its artistic value; but he lays stress on its historical importance. He calls it "a happy index of social change." His conclusion is: "The bourgeoisie were the great dynamic power of the age; they expressed their rich emotional life in the rise of Romantic art; and the funeral elegy furnishes a key to their life and to this art in the first crude, germinating stage." To many this will seem misleading. It might have been better to present the funeral elegy as an historical phenomenon of considerable interest, a form of popular art—and this Professor Draper has admirably done—without making too great a claim for its significance in the evolution of the Romantic movement.

PAULL F. BAUM.

THOMAS LOVELL BEDDOES, ECCENTRIC & POET. By Royall H. Snow. New York: Covici-Friede, 1928. 227 pp.

The bibliography of Beddoes is of course rather slender. His somewhat grim and exotic verse has attracted few admirers and fewer commentators; and Professor Snow's essay is therefore very welcome. To Sir Edmund Gosse's well known Introduction to the *Poetical Works* (just lately re-issued in England in an expensive edition), which was hitherto our chief source of information, Mr. Snow has added interesting details about Beddoes' father and has cleared up a few minor biographical points of the latter half of Beddoes' life. But chiefly he has established the circumstances of Beddoes' death, giving us a story which is less dramatic, perhaps, but more accurate than that of Gosse. On the critical side Mr. Snow is somewhat diffuse. His appreciation of the lyrics is capital. He misses, however, the Otway element in *The Bride's Tragedy*, and the Gothic (almost Byronic) elements of *Death's Jest-Book*. It is this last work naturally which calls for and receives fullest discussion—that "unhappy devil of a tragedy" as Beddoes called it—but one feels that Professor Snow is a bit too cautious in praising it. One could have pardoned a more glowing enthusiasm for that "strange conglomerate" into which Beddoes worked nearly twenty-five years of his thwarted poetic genius. *Death's jest-book* is the Book of Life: evidently an inartistic jumble of poetry and melodrama, of love and hate and revenge and folly, of unseasonable jocularity and sorrow, in a neat arrangement of acts and scenes withal. It is not a "regular" tragedy and will not bear approaching as such. Beddoes presents an unhappy crossing of the romantic temper and the scientific spirit; he turned to rationalism for support and rationalism failed him; whence his pessimism, his despair, his unbalanced grotesqueness. He is, as he said, one of those "who cannot weep without the grace of onions or hartshorn, who take terror by the nose, light our matches with lightning. . . . We who have little belief in heaven and still less in man's heart, are we fit ministers for the temple of Melpomene? O age of crockery! no—let Scandal and Satire be the only reptiles of the soul-abandoned curse of literature." And his splendid failure is summed up and symbolized by the artificial weeping, the terror, the lightning, the scandal and satire and poetic madness of *Death's Jest-Book*.

P. F. B.

FABULOUS NEW ORLEANS. By Lyle Saxon. Illustrated by E. H. Suydam. New York: The Century Co. 1928. xii, 330 pp.

New Orleans is perhaps the most American city in the country. Certainly the history of New Orleans recapitulates, as does that of few

cities, the vicissitudes of American history, taken in its broadest sense. Originally French, it was successively Spanish, French, and American, and it witnessed and was one of the focal points of the great French colonial expansion; it witnessed the passing of New France, the last flicker of Spanish power, and the irresistible advancement of young America. It was, throughout its history, the largest and most important city of the South, the capital of the Cotton Kingdom, the stronghold of slaveocracy, and its destinies were as intimately linked with that peculiar institution as those of any city in America. New Orleans has been part of almost every phase of American life and history, and even its old-worldness, its flavor of antiquity, is an authentic part of its American character.

Certainly it is the most romantic of American cities. At whatever stage of its history we view it, we find romance, glamor, fascination, splendor. Here was displayed that incredible paradox of early America: lords and ladies in fine laces and broadcloth with silver buckles on their slippers, dancing, in this primeval wilderness, to the strains of an ancient minuet. Here were the clash and juxtaposition of races and colors: French, Indian, Negro—and that peculiar product of Louisiana, Creole. The elements of nature also raged uncontrolled—storm and flood and pestilence,—and thereby were displayed splendid heroism and sordid villainy. Here were Mardi Gras and the Carnival and behind them the slave market and the haunted house of the terrible Madame Lalaurie. Negro slaves sang “Juba in and Juba out” while they unloaded bales of cotton on the river front, and Creole dandies duelled under the famous Oaks. Voodoo and strange barbaric music might be heard while Ursuline nuns fingered their rosaries.

It is a vivid and colorful picture that Lyle Saxon and E. H. Suydam have given us in *Fabulous New Orleans*.—Mr. Saxon the story and Mr. Suydam the exquisite illustrations which recapture something of the spirit of the old and the new New Orleans. Mr. Saxon follows the method of presentation he pursued in his admirable *Father Mississippi*, and, as in that charming volume, the happiest section of the book is the introductory chapters—the picture of New Orleans and Mardi Gras through the eyes of a child. Outside of these precious pages, the volume is discursive and journalistic, the chapters of uneven merit, and often poorly articulated to the body of the book. Yet the volume as a whole conveys a sense of magic, of charm and beauty and of sad, forgotten things, and those who love the city may rejoice that it has in Mr. Saxon an affectionate and skillful chronicler and in Mr. Suydam an illustrator of rare perception.

HENRY STEELE COMMAGER.

New York University.

HENRY THE EIGHTH. By Francis Hackett. New York: Horace Liveright, 1929, xi, 452 pp.

Mr. Hackett is well known as a writer with literary skill. In Henry VIII he has a worthy subject. The book, which is the fruit of some years of labor, deserves attention for its merits of style rather than those of erudition. The author describes himself as a "psycho-historian," whatever that may mean. Apparently it involves being "then-minded" and using "imagination and intuition to suggest life," though he feels that "no vividness excuses infidelity to the facts." Therefore he seeks "to base this history entirely on material provided by the unselfish labor of hosts of scholars, who, in matters of fact, must have the last word."

So much deserves to be said to indicate the plan of the book. The result makes good light reading, more interesting than most novels, though the subjects dealt with are not always pleasant. Mr. Hackett's Henry is an odd mixture of a hero and a villain. How closely he resembles the real Henry may cause a difference of opinion. The author realized that some readers would need a little more history than is provided in the body of the book, and so appended some thirty pages of "Background." It is doubtful whether it is enough.

A book on a sixteenth-century king with the names of his wives as the topics of its several divisions runs the risk of leaving a false impression on its readers, if it does not indicate a lack of a sense of proportion on the part of the author. Henry, to be sure, was much married, and several of the wives played highly important rôles in his life and reign. But after all, Henry was much more of a king than a husband, and to be a king, in the sixteenth century even more than now, meant that the most intimate family decisions of the monarch were primarily matters of state and were seldom determined by whims of personal passion in the way that Mr. Hackett is sometimes in danger of leading us to suppose. There were groups at court striving with each other for supremacy. To accomplish their purposes these groups spent much time and effort managing the King and other people who counted. By overlooking the more difficult aspects of the tasks of these leaders, Mr. Hackett leaves the impression that they were of a smaller caliber than their achievements prove them to have been.

The moral is, perhaps, that a "psycho-historian" ought to beware of dealing with a king. A king has so little chance of being an ordinary human person and must be so much a state figure that he becomes thereby a better subject for history than biography. Even Henry's wives were probably as much figureheads of contending factions as they

were objects of the King's passion. Mr. Hackett's book can be heartily recommended for summer reading, as can good novels written with regard for historical atmosphere and with some consideration of biographical facts. It will hardly serve so well readers who wish to understand one of the most revolutionary eras in the history of English society.

W. T. LAPRADE.

THE LANCE OF JUSTICE: a Semi-Centennial History of the Legal Aid Society, 1876-1926. By John MacArthur Maguire. Cambridge; The Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. xi, 295.

Probably never before in the history of our courts and of our legal procedure has justice been more elusive than at the present time. Yet the problem of obtaining justice has been with us always and it is as old as the courts themselves. The reasons that are frequently given for this condition are many and varied, and yet all writers of necessity must admit the difficulty that the poor have in obtaining justice in the courts. Any attempt to remedy this condition is worthy of attention and it is, therefore, remarkable how little attention has been given to the Legal Aid Society, an organization for the avowed purpose of "bringing justice to the poor."

The *Lance of Justice* is an historical account of the formation, development, and fields of activity of the Legal Aid Society of New York City. In the beginning the Legal Aid Society was a German organization called the "Deutscher Rechts-Schutz Verein." The purpose of this association was to look after and to protect the newly arrived German immigrant who was ignorant of the law and the legal methods of the United States. Its purpose was so laudatory that at the end of the first year the Society had a membership of fifty-eight who were paying annual dues of twenty dollars, a not inconsiderable amount in the year 1876. Later this organization became the Legal Aid Society and its fields of activity became much broader.

The history of the development of the organization is noteworthy because of three reasons: first, because of the type of men who have been at the head of the Society; second, because of the kaleidoscopic character of the duties in which the Society has been engaged; third, because of the amount and the quality of the work which the organization has accomplished. When we read the account of the work of Mr. Von Briesen, a former president of the Society, it is probably impossible not to notice that the author becomes laudatory. In fact the whole book is an enthusiastic and sympathetic account of the development of the activities of the Society, but it would undoubtedly be hard to

write on this subject in any other fashion. The author realizes this and states in his concluding remarks that "the whole volume down to this point has been a tincture of optimism, somewhat diluted by statements of unavoidable shortcomings but certainly containing few adverse criticisms of the Society and its work. All legal aid geese have appeared as swans. For that manner of presentation, excuse is not lacking. A little hero worship does no harm, and may well be bestowed upon a group of men and women who have labored hard, persistently, and quite unselfishly for the betterment of society." Theodore Roosevelt even referred to the Society as one great safeguard "against the men who in the effort to undo existing injustice plunge us into chaos which would mean injustice of an infinitely worse type."

The fields of activities of the Society have been many and varied. The entire history of the Society shows an honest attempt to meet new conditions and to give aid to those groups who were suffering the most from the difficulties of the law. In its early history the Society acted at many times as a collection agency. It has always been particularly interested in the immigrants. When the Negroes started their exodus to the north the Legal Aid Society took on this added burden. During the World War a special office was set up for the purpose of giving draft information. In order to carry out this varied work branches have been established over the city of New York and today it is true that the activities of the Society have been extended to "East side, West side all about the town."

The book itself is well written. It has an introduction by Mr. William D. Guthrie, Ex-President of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and of the New York State Bar Association. The style and subject matter both aid in sustaining the reader's interest. The volume is remarkably free from mistakes although the year 1923 which is given on page 31 is obviously wrong. The only real criticism that can be made of the book is that there is some danger of the reader becoming lost in the mass of detail which it contains. The number of short illustrations, the account of the establishment of branches, all confuse the reader to some extent, yet it is undoubtedly true that Professor Maguire has produced an interesting and valuable piece of work and the reader lays the book down with admiration for the men who are responsible for the Legal Aid Society and with an avowed interest "in the greatest movement of all English and American legal history for bringing justice to the poor."

ROBERT STANLEY RANKIN.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

THE HUGUENOTS OF COLONIAL SOUTH CAROLINA

By ARTHUR H. HIRSCH (20-odd plates.) Price \$5.00
The social, political, and religious contributions of the French Protestants in Carolina. Numerous portraits restored from rare miniatures and oil paintings.

THE NEW ENGLAND CLERGY AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

By ALICE M. BALDWIN Price \$3.50
A study of ecclesiastical thought and practice in its relation to political theory and action in the New England of Revolutionary times.

THE SOUTHERN FRONTIER, 1670-1732

By VERNER W. CRANE
Brown University.

—A notable contribution to the history of westward expansion in colonial times, with South Carolina and British Imperial policy as central themes. The conflict of nationalities on the far Southern frontier was not only Anglo-Spanish but Anglo-French; "not Oswego in 1727 but Altamaha in 1721 saw the inception of the British eighteenth century scheme of frontier posts to counteract French expansion." Interlocking with imperial aims was the Carolinian Indian trade—a trade hitherto undescribed. The concluding chapters give to the foundation of Georgia a perspective on Colonial and Imperial strategy as well as British philanthropy.

GEORGIA AND THE UNION IN 1850

Price \$4.50

By RICHARD HARRISON SHRYOCK,
Associate Professor of History in Duke University.

The policy of Georgia was a highly important factor in the attitude of the lower South toward the Union in the crisis of 1850. The economic and social forces which primarily determined that policy are analyzed by Dr. Shryock in such a way as to further our knowledge of the "Cotton Kingdom" as well as to explain why Georgia preferred Union to Secession during the critical years from 1844 to 1852.

THE STORY OF DURHAM: CITY OF THE NEW SOUTH.

By WILLIAM KENNETH BOYD, Price \$3.00
Professor of History in Duke University.

The history of the rise of a southern industrial community of peculiar importance written in an interesting manner by a competent historian with a unique opportunity to know whereof he writes.

AN ANTHOLOGY OF VERSE BY AMERICAN NEGROES.

By NEWMAN IVEY WHITE, Price \$2.00
Professor of English in Duke University.

WALTER CLINTON JACKSON,
Vice-President of the North Carolina College for Women.
"Without doubt the best anthology of American Negro poetry that has yet appeared. . . . There is about it the flavor—the desire, burning and impassioned—to be fair and square to these black bards, to overlook their race and judge their work according to the universally accepted standards of literature. . . . There is an introduction . . . which is the most brilliant, the most illuminating appraisal of Negro poetry."—*The New Republic*.

Catalog on Request.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

DURHAM, N. C.

When you think
of Bread, think of

Golden Krust

For sale by
all Grocers

PASCHALL'S BAKERY
121 North Duke Street
DURHAM, N. C.

FANCY ICES BLOCK CREAM

Blue Ribbon

Ice Cream

URHAM ICE CREAM
COMPANY, INC.

We make any color lots for
Frat and Sorority
Banquets

PHONE L-963

MAIN AT DUKE

PUNCHES

SHERBETS

The
Hispanic American
Historical Review

JAMES A. ROBERTSON,
J. FRED RIPPY,
Editors

For the promotion of
good will among the
American family of
nations through a better
understanding of their
mutual history.

Published Quarterly
\$4.00 a Year

Complete Back Files Available
at \$5.00 per Volume.

DUKE UNIVERSITY
PRESS
DURHAM, N. C.

R. Blacknall
& Son

Druggists

GEER BUILDING

OPPOSITE POST OFFICE

DURHAM, N. C.

American Literature

A Journal of Literary History, Criticism and Bibliography

Board of Editors: Jay B. Hubbell, Duke University, chairman; W. B. Cairns, University of Wisconsin; Kenneth B. Murdock, Harvard University; Fred Lewis Pattee, Pennsylvania State College; Ralph L. Rusk, Columbia University.

Published Quarterly by the Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina, with the coöperation of the American Literature Group of the Modern Language Association of America.

Subscription \$4.00 per year
\$1.00 Single Copy

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DURHAM, N. C.

William and Mary Quarterly

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

Published by the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

EDITORS

J. A. C. CHANDLER,
President William and Mary College

E. G. SWEM,
Librarian William and Mary College

The purpose of the *Quarterly* is to print new information relating to the history of Virginia.

ISSUED QUARTERLY

Subscription, \$4.00
Single Copy, \$1.00

THOMAS & HOWARD COMPANY

WHOLESALE GROCERS



DURHAM, N. C.
GREENSBORO, N. C.
CHARLOTTE, N. C.
COLUMBIA, S. C.
GREENVILLE, S. C.
SPARTANBURG, S. C.

J. SOUTHGATE & SON

Insurance

DURHAM, N. C.

Orders Inquiries

60 pages

Send for
FREE COPY

Can be
Secured
by
MAIL

POLK'S REFERENCE Book and Mailing List Catalog

Gives counts and prices on over 2,000 different lines of business. No matter what your business, in this book you will find the number of your prospective customers listed.

Valuable information is also given as to how you can use the mails to secure orders and inquiries for your products or services.

Write for Your FREE Copy

R. L. POLK & CO., Detroit, Mich.

Largest City Directory Publishers in the World
Mailing List Compilers—Business Statistics
Producers of Direct Mail Advertising

MIKADO

*The
YELLOW
PENCIL
WITH THE
RED
BAND*

*Have Your
Scribblings
Analyzed*

Louise Rice, world famous graphologist, can positively read your talents, virtues and faults in the drawings, words and what notes that you scribble when "lost in thought".

Send your "scribblings" or signature for analysis. Enclose the picture of the Mikado head, cut from a box of Mikado pencils, and ten cents. Address Louise Rice, care of

EAGLE PENCIL CO., NEW YORK CITY

